

Proposal 1: **I Disagree:** This hunt should remain closed until such a time that a healthy population capable of supporting hunting exists. At that time it should be reopened with age restrictions on the rams available to harvest. Similar to Proposal 119.

**Proposal 2: I Agree:** Resident subsistence hunters are by far the largest user group. Their harvests far exceed anything that is sustainable. It must be limited.

**Proposal 3: I Disagree:** Nonresident harvest of caribou is extremely minimal, but the amount of money brought into local communities has a large, beneficial, impact. This proposal will not benefit the herd. Only by limiting resident subsistence hunters will we be able to allow the herd to come back.

**Proposal 4: I Agree:** I feel that even more limitations are warranted. There should be a maximum of 4 caribou total and only one or none may be cows. If we want the population to increase harvest must be restricted and cows must be allowed to stay in the breeding population.

**Proposal 5: I Agree:** Limiting resident subsistence harvest is the only way to successfully allow the herd to recover.

**Proposal 6: I Disagree:** The scientific evidence does not support this.

**Proposal 15: I Disagree:** If the musk ox herd is a healthy population capable of supporting hunting, then the opportunity should be opened up for all AK residents, not just subsistence users.

**Proposal 18: I Agree:** I agree only if the scientific evidence is there to support hunting of this herd. If this season was indeed closed without scientific evidence to support the decision then it should be reopened.

**Proposal 32: I Disagree:** This is an unnecessary proposal and would put undue hardship on all other user groups in favor of one.

**Proposal 33: I Agree:** Only if the scientific data supports this reduction. Residents must also do what we can to help the sheep population return.

**Proposal 34: I Disagree:** This hunt should remain closed until it has a population capable of supporting hunting wherein it should reopen with age restricted harvest similar to proposal 119. The tool does not matter, only the harvest age and numbers.

**Proposal 36: I Agree:** This must be done to allow the herd to return.

**Proposal 37: I Agree:** This must be done to allow the herd to return.

**Proposal 38: I Disagree:** Nonresident harvest is extremely minimal. Closing the hunt to nonresidents would accomplish nothing as long as resident subsistence users continue to harvest huge numbers of caribou every season.

**Proposal 43: I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedents. Regulations should be levied on nonresident hunters first. Nonresident hunters should be draw only and only allowed one every five years. Secondly there is no justification for any ram or any sheep hunts while restrictions are being considered and they should be abolished.

**Proposal 44: : I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedents. Regulations should be levied on nonresident hunters first. Nonresident hunters should be draw only and only allowed one every five years. Secondly there is no justification for any ram or any sheep hunts while restrictions are being considered and they should be abolished.

**Proposal 45: I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedents. Regulations should be levied on nonresident hunters first. Nonresident hunters should be draw only and only allowed one every five years. Secondly there is no justification for any ram or any sheep hunts while restrictions are being considered and they should be abolished.

**Proposal 46: I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedents. Regulations should be levied on nonresident hunters first. Nonresident hunters should be draw only and only allowed one every five years. Secondly there is no justification for any ram or any sheep hunts while restrictions are being considered and they should be abolished.

**Proposal 47: I Disagree:** Bison should not be a proxy animal. They are not a primary food animal.

**Proposal 76: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 77: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 78: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 79: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence

and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 80: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 81: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 82: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be open to subsistence use period. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Subsistence and Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 83: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling and should not be opened back up in 19C, an already closed area. Secondly this proposal seeks to create an advantage for Nonresidents over resident hunters. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 84: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 85: I Agree:** This is a good management plan similar to Proposal 119. It should also be applied to nonresident hunters and Guides. Keeping younger breeding age rams in the population is of the utmost importance.

**Proposal 86: I Agree:** This is a good management plan similar to Proposal 119. It should also be applied to nonresident hunters and Guides. Keeping younger breeding age rams in the population is of the utmost importance.

**Proposal 87: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 88: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 89: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 90: I Disagree** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 91: I Disagree:** Sheep populations are struggling statewide and should not be open to subsistence use period. This area is closed for a reason and should remain closed.

**Proposal 92: I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedents. Regulations should be levied on nonresident hunters first. Nonresident hunters should be draw only and only allowed one every five years. Secondly there is no justification for any ram or any sheep hunts while restrictions are being considered and they should be abolished.

**Proposal 112: I Agree:** All hunting should be regulated and reduced until the herd is back within management goals.

**Proposal 113: I Agree:** All hunting should be regulated and reduced until the herd is back within management goals. Furthermore this would help with serious safety issues associated with this hunt.

**Proposal 115: I Agree:** Proper meat care is a common sense issue. I have seen many caribou from this hunt that were spoiled from poor field care.

**Proposal 118: I Disagree:** Hunting is hunting, it does not matter what tool is used. Harvest numbers are the real indicator that needs to be monitored. This proposal is unnecessary and seeks to create an advantage for one specific user group.

**Proposal 119: I Agree:** This proposal has been used for years in Canada. It should be applied state wide as well as applied to all Guides and their clients. Guides should be allocated a determined number of tags based on years in business and other pertinent information. They should then loose tags from that allocation for every ram killed under 8 years old. This is the same management that is used in Canada with great effect.

**Proposal 130: I Agree:** Resident hunters should have precedence. Currently the regulations are weighted towards guided clients and that needs to change.

**Proposal 131: I Disagree:** Resident hunters should have precedence. Up to 10% of the permits is acceptable, however it should not be required. If nonresidents are randomly issued less than 10% then that is what is issued and the remaining permits should be allocated to resident hunters.

**Proposal 132: I Disagree:** This is unnecessary and seeks to create an advantage for one specific user group. The tool used is irrelevant. Harvest numbers are all that matters.

**Proposal 133: I Agree:** This is unnecessary and seeks to create an advantage for one specific user group. The tool used is irrelevant. Harvest numbers are all that matters.

**Proposal 134: I Disagree:** Random draw is the fairest system. This is not necessary simply because the author wants the tag.

**Proposal 135: I Disagree:** Nonresidents must be allowed access to hunting in Alaska, however Residents deserve precedence. A specialized hunt such as this should be one every 5-10 years for nonresidents.

**Proposal 139: I Agree:** Something must be done and local subsistence hunters are by far the heaviest user group.

**Proposal 140: I Disagree:** Nonresident hunters do not take enough animals to make a difference, but the money brought in to the local economy is substantial. Resident Subsistence hunters kill such large numbers of caribou that regulations on any other user group would not accomplish anything.

**Proposal 141: I Agree:** There is no justification for youth sheep hunts especially when sheep are struggling. Sheep are not food species, they are a trophy species. They are not the best option for creating opportunities to get youths into the sport hunting.

**Proposal 142: I Disagree:** This is unnecessary and seeks to create an advantage for one specific user group. The tool used is irrelevant. Harvest numbers are all that matters.

**Proposal 143: I Agree:** Sheep are struggling and extended seasons put undue stress on the population.

**Proposal 144: I Agree:** Sheep are struggling and guided clients are more heavily using areas that are still open. It is not sustainable to keep increasing the hunting pressure in these areas.

Proposal 154: I Disagree: Increased harvest when caribou are struggling statewide is a poor idea and unnecessary.

Proposal 155: I Disagree: Increased harvest when caribou are struggling statewide is a poor idea and unnecessary

Proposal 156: I Disagree: This hunt remains one of the few hunts still open. As long as the population can support hunting it should remain open. I would support turning this hunt into a registration hunt for all as it is one of the most accessible and should be monitored closely.

Proposal 158: I Agree: All nonresident sheep hunts should be draw only.

Proposal 159: I Disagree: Sheep populations are struggling. Increasing hunting regardless of the weapon used, also increases the pressure and stress on the animals. If the population is able to support hunting it should be open with age restrictions on harvest, not weapon restrictions.

Proposal 160: I Disagree: This proposal is not necessary and seeks to create an advantage for one user group. If the population is able to support hunting it should be open with age restrictions on harvest, not weapon restrictions.

Proposal 161: I Disagree: This proposal is not necessary and seeks to create an advantage for one user group. If the population is able to support hunting it should be open with age restrictions on harvest, not weapon restrictions.

Proposal 162: I Disagree: This proposal is not necessary and seeks to create an advantage for one user group. If the population is able to support hunting it should be open with age restrictions on harvest, not weapon restrictions.

Proposal 180: I Agree: Residents should have precedence over nonresidents in any and all hunting opportunities within the state. Allocating more than 10% of tags available to nonresidents should not be allowed.

Proposal 181: I Agree: We all have to do our part to help sheep recover. Nonresident sheep hunts should be a draw for the entire state.