



Submitted By
Jonathan Shurtz
Submitted On
2/6/2020 12:30:34 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-371-7046

Email
Copperwild@gmail.com

Address
1536 Richardson highway
North Pole , Alaska 99712

I oppose Proposal 71 to allow baiting of Grizzly/Brown Bears in Unit 24A. Unit 24A is road accessible via the Dalton Highway and provides a pristine environment to hunt both Brown/Grizzly Bears and Black Bears with archery equipment. There are many Grizzly bears in this unit and allowing hunters to bait them would congregate them into prime moose calving grounds when they are most vulnerable. Additionally, this area receives little pressure from hunters in the spring and if baiting is allowed for grizzly bears there stands to be a significant increase in activity, hunter conflict, etc. There are many units that allow Brown/Grizzly Bear baiting but none of them are nearly as accessible or pristine as the DHCMA portion of Unit 24A. If the Department feels the need for an increased harvest in this particular area, there are other means to achieve that, such as allowing for a 2 bear harvest, reduction in NR Tag prices, same day airborne harvest or an extended season. I strongly oppose this proposal.



Submitted By
Dougless Skinner
Submitted On
2/21/2020 1:20:34 PM
Affiliation

Phone
4062397370
Email
dskinner1211@gmail.com
Address
1781 Whippoorwill LN
Fairbanks, Alaska 99702

This comment is in support of Proposal Number 56, to establish a minimum trapping distance. My name is Dougless Skinner, I moved to Fairbanks in 2016, and currently reside in the Goldstream Valley. Alaska is home to me and I am working on my anthropology PhD degree at the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

On Monday February 17th, I took my two dogs to the top of Murphy Dome to run in the parking lot. I often take them to Murphey Dome because I feel it is an adequate distance from town to let them run off-leash (although I recognize the leash laws still apply there). I have been hiking on Murphey Dome for the past three winters, in fact, last year I did a University project on top of the Dome and was there literally every week in February. Then in 2018, while taking a small hike along a snowmobile trail with my dog, I was told by a trapper that he had a trap-line some miles out. I heartily thanked him for the knowledge and turned around immediately. On Monday the 17th, 2020 I wanted to let my two dogs run off-leash around the lot, but I no longer take them out any distance because of what the trapper told me in 2018. The dogs quickly ran down one of the trails where people often go on walks. I walked after them and called them back. Only one of my dogs came back and he had a piece of frozen meat in his mouth. I called for my other dog, because it was unlike her not to listen, and couldn't find her. I began to panic and tried to get my puppy to show me where she was. I came across a post with a blank CD attached to it about 50 m from the parking lot down the well travel snow machine trail, I thought it was maybe a marker for snow machines or for dog mushers who often mush up there because of its reflective quality. I didn't realize until later it was marking the location to the baited wolf snare right next to the snow machine path. When I found my girl she was already foaming and bleeding from her mouth. I tried to unhook the snare, but it was so tight and my hands were already cold and frozen, so I couldn't get it off her. I even tried to cut it from her neck with my knife causing severe damage to my hands. I was unsuccessful at getting the snare off, and I held her in my lap while she wheezed foaming blood from her mouth. I felt so horrible watching her die this painful death, that I wanted to put her out of her misery and used the knife I had, and pushed it quickly into her heart. She made a horrible noise, then died quickly and in a lot of pain. I was able to unhook the snare when all the air left her and she was dead. I then carried her lifeless body back to my car. Challis (my dog) was a husky mix, so she wasn't a small dog, and I am not a super strong women, but I was able to carry her all the way back to my car because it was literally 50 m away. I relive this tragedy in every spare moment, my mind returns to trying to save my best friend and my stark inability to do so. She was my first dog and I loved her like a human, we literally did everything together. She was a good girl and voice commands worked with her. She would have come back if she hadn't have been caught. I did everything I could to save her, but in the end I had to do what I was taught from childhood, and put a dying animal out of its misery, knowing my lack of knowledge is what killed her.

I absolutely 100% respect the rights to trap. Alaska is so awesome with its freedom to subsist. The ability to learn to subsist is one of the reasons (besides for attending UAF) that I wanted to move here. In fact I have been learning to trap and have gone multiple times out with friends. I am not angry that someone had a snare out there. I knew there were snares in the area, which is why I stuck around the parking lot. I wasn't aware however that snares could be that close to a public access point--and when I repeated this story to dog-owning friends they were shocked because they also weren't aware and take their dogs to the dome regularly. In fact, one of my friends had his dog on the dome the week before.

I take responsibility for letting my dog roam in an area where there were traps. However, I was not aware that the Fairbanks Borough allowed traps to be that close to public access points. I don't think many people are, and if the snares are not clearly marked (as this one wasn't) how would anyone with no knowledge of trapping even comprehend that the snares were there. Although, I have gone trapping twice, my lack of knowledge about snares and the proximity of the snare to the parking lot, killed my best friend.

I want people to be able to trap, but I think the location where this trapper set the snare was absolutely negligent. To have a baited wolf snare next to the parking lot where people go on walks all the time is very confusing to me. There are people on top of Murphey Dome all the time! In fact tourists go up there at night, in the dark, to look at the lights, what if that snare had injured one of them. People even take their kids up there...what if something had happened to them. It was literally right next to the parking lot on a well-traveled snow machine trail.

I have been completely traumatized by the events that occurred. I cry myself to sleep every night thinking about holding Challis' (my dogs) head in my lap telling her I love her and it's going to be alright, as I pet her with my bloody, torn hands. I almost had to get stitches on two of my fingers and one cut may have damaged a nerve. I am going to seek out therapy to try and rid myself of this overwhelming guilt I feel for not being able to save my beloved baby, and feeling like all I could do for her was put her out of her misery. I absolutely do not wish this horrible, overwhelming sadness and guilt on anyone else. That's why I am supporting Proposal 56 to establish a minimum distance law for trappers. It will help stop occurrences like this from happening. These types of incidences can be very painful, and I worry about kids and other people innocently walking in the area with no clue about the trapping laws.

Thank you for your time.





Submitted By
Kenneth M Soik
Submitted On
2/20/2020 9:50:09 PM
Affiliation

Proposal 56

I am against this proposal. There are many animals that can be harvested within this area without any problems to anyone. This harvest can be used to control populations, reduce neusance animals and bring in revenue.

Thank you for taking my comment

Kenneth M Soik



Submitted By
Mike Soik
Submitted On
2/20/2020 8:29:15 PM
Affiliation

Proposal 56

Chairman Spraker,

I oppose proposal 56. This proposal would unnecessarily close large areas to trapping. As there are no exceptions in this proposal it would prevent a person from trapping destructive animals like red squirrels around a person's home or cabin. You can trap furbearers like ermine, marten, mink, muskrat, and beaver without a threat to domestic dogs and cats, because the sets are enclosed in a cubby, elevated above the ground, or under the ice. If this proposal were to pass I would anticipate that a similar proposal would appear in each region of the state during subsequent Board of Game meetings and close vast areas of the state to trapping, so I urge you to reject this proposal.

Thank you,

Mike Soik

Submitted By
Mike Soik
Submitted On
2/20/2020 9:35:12 PM
Affiliation

Proposal 152

Chairman Spraker,

I oppose proposal 152. Denali National Park & Preserve contains over 6 million acres and I don't think any additional state land should be closed to the hunting and trapping of wolves. What will happen when the "park" wolves are found to travel outside the proposed buffer area? Will the park service request an expansion to this buffer area? The most recent visitor data (<https://www.nps.gov/dena/learn/management/statistics.htm>) that I could find from the National Park Service shows an annual increase in visitors from 2012 to 2017. I don't think it is the State of Alaska's responsibility to guarantee Denali National Park visitors that they will see wolves or any other animals. I urge you to reject this proposal.

Thank you,

Mike Soik



Submitted By
Matt Sprau
Submitted On
2/21/2020 8:57:50 PM
Affiliation

In reference to Proposal #56.

My wife and I have traveled on trails throughout interior Alaska including creating and hosting the Tanana River Challenge, a multi-sport race that has a mission for encouraging shared trail use. We have shared trails with trappers and have friends that engage in this important Alaska tradition.

We understand the complexities in managing trail use for multiple users. Our own experiences, though, indicate that the current laws and regulations are written to protect the freedom of trappers without considerations given to any other trail user. For example, we were skijoring on the Fairbanks-Circle trail and encountered a conibear trap directly adjacent to a trail marker. As a historic trail, it has value to a number of users including trappers. This does not mean however, that the use of this trail should be governed by one group alone because they engage in behavior that has a high likelihood of harming other users. Even with our dogs in harness, there was a real risk that our dogs could have been easily trapped.

We appreciate that the Alaska Trappers Association has a code of ethics to guide trapping practices. While this is an important community contribution, in no other fishing or hunting practice does such an organization provide the main source of regulation for other users engaging in that activity for the entire state. As a member of the public, I have essentially no recourse for unethical behavior other than reporting it to the organization and hoping that it will be resolved. In what way does this represent an acceptable modern land management practice?

Every year we have the same conversation. More of our friends and colleagues have dogs that are trapped with either minor or severe consequences. At what point do we continue to let the approximately 3500 registered trappers in the state dictate land-use policy for the rest of us? We support the ability for communities to develop their own land-use policies to manage these issues and revisit them at regular intervals to adjust them as necessary.



Submitted By
Rick Steiner
Submitted On
2/8/2020 6:37:35 AM
Affiliation

I ask that the Board adopt following amendments to NPS (Denali National Park) Proposal #152:

- 1. Closed area enlarged, to align with that which was passed by the Alaska House of Representatives in HB 105 in 2017;**
- 2. A year-round closure;**
- 3. Prohibit take of all predator species (wolves, brown bear, black bear, lynx, wolverine, coyote)**

The NPS proposal is simply inadequate to achieve the desired result of improving wildlife viewing success in the Park. Consider this a controlled scientific experiment. A small (inadequate) buffer was in place from 2000 - 2010, and wolf viewing success was good; the buffer was removed from 2010 - 2020, and wolf viewing success declined from 45% to only 1% last year; now the state should reinstate a sufficient buffer from 2020 - 2030, and monitor visitor viewing success, visitor numbers, and visitor spending in the Park, to determine effects of the buffer.

Please see further discussion here: <https://www.ustart.org/search/google/redirect.php?url=https%3A//www.adn.com/opinions/2019/10/16/state-ignores-decline-of-denali-national-park-economy/&ref=ADN%20Rick%20Steiner%20Denali>

Thank you.



Submitted By
Bob Stewart
Submitted On
2/13/2020 7:24:28 AM
Affiliation
Pope and Young Club

Phone
7135697525
Email
docbob@comcast.net
Address
17315 Klee Circle
Spring, Texas 77379

Esteemed Board of game members:

As a hunter from Texas with Alaska on my hunting destination itinerary, I would like to share some thoughts about the upcoming meeting and a couple of proposals. I feel certain that the majority of visiting bow hunters in Alaska would agree on the following.

Proposal 50:

This proposal is being made by the Alaskan Bowhunters Association. The purpose of this proposal is to establish a 10 day archery only registration hunt for bull moose that would begin at the end of all general bull moose seasons in units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, & 26C. Passing this proposal would be a win for all bowhunters in Alaska and could eventually be approved in other regions.

Things to consider:

- 1. Cooler temperatures to minimize waste of game meat harvested in later season.
- 2. More opportunity for hunters to stay in the field longer without having a significant impact on moose populations.
- 3. Potential for more state revenue created by non-resident hunters booking additional archery moose hunts through outfitters.
- 4. Registration hunt allows for close monitoring of participation and success rates by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
- 5. Bowhunters would still be limited to the same antler restrictions outlined in the general season.

Proposal 53:

This proposal is also being made by the Alaskan Bowhunters Association and its purpose is to add an archery only registration hunt for dall sheep. This hunt would begin 9 days immediately preceding all general sheep seasons in units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, & 26C. If passed, this registration hunt would afford bowhunters a great opportunity to pursue dall sheep before the masses of rifle hunters hit the mountains.

Thoughts to consider

- 1. More opportunity for hunters to stay in the field longer while having almost no impact on sheep populations.
- 2. Registration hunt allows for close monitoring of participation and success rates by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
- 3. Bowhunters would still be limited to the same legal animals as outlined in the general season hunts.
- 4. Potential for more state revenue created by non-resident hunters booking additional archery sheep hunts through outfitters.

Proposal 49:

This is an individual proposal made by Jim Sacket. The purpose of the proposal is to allow any resident hunter who is 60 years old or older who possesses a Senior Alaska Resident Card, to hunt with a crossbow during any archery only hunt in units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, & 26C. This proposal could create a significant negative effect on the Dalton Highway Corridor, as well as other bowhunting opportunities in the region. The Alaskan Bowhunters Association **DOES NOT** endorse or support this proposal. If this proposal is passed, it will have a



Thoughts to consider:

- 1. The State of Alaska already allows individuals with disabilities to apply for a Method and Means Exemption allowing the use of crossbows during archery only seasons.
- 2. The average person age 60 and older has no problem handling a 50 pound compound bow with 85% let off (7.5 lbs).
- 3. Allowing a mass of crossbows could have a significant impact on wildlife population creating more restrictions and less opportunity for bowhunters.
- 4. Out of 334 general, registration, and draw hunts in the affected region, 320 are non weapon restricted and already allow the use of crossbows as a legal method of take.
- 5. This proposal is obviously meant for non-bowhunters to take advantage of special areas including the Dalton Highway Corridor.
- 6. Allowing less restricted crossbow use in this region could eventually effect our bowhunting opportunities across the state.
- 7. I personally feel strongest about this proposal for the above reasons. Please vote to keep any locking device prohibited on all legal archery equipment used for the purpose of hunting.

Thank you so much for your consideration

Dr. Bob Stewart



Submitted By
John Strassenburgh
Submitted On
2/17/2020 3:18:45 PM
Affiliation

February 16, 2020

Public comment in support of Region III BOG (March 2020) Proposal 152.

I write in support of Proposal 152, Closure Proposal 1

I have lived in South-central Alaska for nearly 50 years, the last 22 of which have been in the northern Susitna Valley. I have visited Denali National Park many times over the years. The reason I visit the Park is to view and photograph wildlife in a place of magnificent landscapes.

I have not seen a wolf in Denali National Park in at least a decade.

A significant percentage of the reason for this dearth of viewing opportunity is human caused, specifically because the State allows hunting and trapping of wolves in the Stampede Area. This area is bounded on three sides by Denali National Park.

I support Proposal 152, Closure Proposal 1 because it is the most protective of the two closure options, as the Proposal document states, Proposal Closure 1 is: *"the most effective closure in terms of limiting harvest of wolves that primarily reside within the boundaries of the park and provide the majority of wolf sightings."*

The Proposal 152 document states: *"Over the last 20 years, the average number of individuals harvesting a wolf from this area is less than 2 people per year. This proposed change may impact the lifestyle or livelihood of a few trappers who use the area."*

The Proposal 152 document also explains its benefits, including 400,000 people who visit the Park each year, tourism and wildlife viewing related businesses.

I have never understood the logic of Board of Game, which, year after year, fails consider the many in favor of literally just a handful of hunters/trappers.

It seems obvious that good and appropriate public policy is to prohibit hunting and trapping of wolves, thereby protecting them during a particular sensitive time in their life cycle. Proposal 152, closure proposal 1, would provide such protection.

I think many Alaskans, including the Board of Game members, sometimes fail to appreciate the strong effect that seeing wildlife in a natural setting has on visitors. I have had friends from the lower 48 come to Alaska, visit Denali National Park, and stopping by to see me on their way back home who were so enthusiastic about their experience in the Park that they could barely stop talking about it. It is a really big deal to most visitors (it still is for me after all these years), which they don't soon forget.

The National Park Service has bent over backwards to achieve a compromise with the state. Its Proposal 152 well reasoned and well grounded in sound science. Proposal 152, proposed closure 1 is carefully targeted to a particularly critical time for the wolves, and yet allow hunting and trapping of wolves in the less critical times. This retains hunting/trapping opportunity while better ensuring sustainability of the wolves in this part of the Park. Note that, according to the Proposal Document, Proposal 152 would reduce wolf hunting season by

only 29 percent and reduces wolf trapping season by 50 percent, and this would have a materially helpful effect on of the wolf packs.



The Proposal 152 strikes an appropriate balance between hunting/trapping and non-consumptive uses as wildlife viewing and photography and the various businesses that benefit from that activity.

Please approve Proposal 152, proposed closure 1.

Sincerely,



Submitted By
Suzanne
Submitted On
2/19/2020 9:40:21 AM
Affiliation
Strisik

Phone
9078687843

Email
sstrisik@gmail.com

Address
P. O. Box 93606
Anchorage, Alaska 99509-3606

I support Proposal 152, Closure Option 1. Partial wolf hunting and trapping closures just outside Denali National Park (Uniform Coding Units 0607, 0605, and 0502 west of George Parks Highway and bounded by Denali National Park) are very important to the survival and welfare of this population. It is vital to have these creatures alive and vibrant, part of the natural life of the landscape, than dead. Thank you.



11/28/2019 04:42 AM AKST

RE: PROPOSAL 55: Allow the use of dogs for hunting for lynx in Units 12 and 20

The proposed season of October 15th to December 31st would limit issues of disturbing young wildlife during the spring when they are most vulnerable. The proposed season also has minimal interference with other big game hunting seasons with the exception of a few draw permits in Unit 20. Due to the lack of people who hunt with hounds in Alaska I don't foresee a large number of lynx being harvested by hound hunters and therefore lynx populations would not be greatly effected by allowing this change. Per the trapping regulations, there is currently no bag limit for lynx in unit 12 and 20. Based off Alaska Fish and Game trapping reports over the last several years (2010-2018, with the exclusion of 2014-2015) there have been anywhere from 2-99 lynx harvested/trapped in unit 12 and 20-450 in unit 20. Based off of these numbers and the unlimited bag limit these units would be able to sustain a few lynx harvested by hounds men. While Alaska is not known for hound hunting or have a large history in this hunting method, the use of hounds for pursuing and harvesting black bears in Alaska has been permitted since 1966. In 1992 policies were created that restricted hound hunting to certain times of the year, limited the number of permits issued during each year, and tracked the number of bears treed and harvested. According to black bear management reports from July 1st, 2004 to June 30th, 2013 there have been very few permits issued for this purpose and approximately 1-4 bears are harvested with dogs each year. This just goes to show that this in not a very popular method of hunting in Alaska and would not cause a dramatic increase in lynx harvests. Hunting lynx with hounds could be managed very similarly to hunting bears in the fact that those who are interested could be required to have permit. Respectfully, Sara Suda Wasilla, Alaska

Sara Suda

11/28/2019 05:02 AM AKST

RE: PROPOSAL 129: Change the closure dates for the Yanert Controlled Use Area (CUA) in Unit 20A to align with the Wood River CUA, and clarify whether horse feed is considered "hunting gear"

I support this proposal and agree that motorized vehicles during the winter months should be allowed. There are several outfitters as well as resident hunters who hunt this area with horses and find it very difficult to provide enough hay/grain for their livestock during the hunting season. Currently the only way is to fly feed into these camp which becomes very costly. I also don't believe hay/grain should be considered as "hunting gear".



Submitted By
Brent Taft
Submitted On
2/14/2020 7:26:09 AM
Affiliation

As a prospective nonresident hunter I do not support Proposal 49 by Jim Sacket. Inclusion of crossbows during archery only hunts is inappropriate for able bodied persons and starts us down a slippery slope. Additionally,

- The State of Alaska already allows individuals with disabilities to apply for a Method and Means Exemption allowing the use of crossbows during archery only seasons.
- The average person age 60 and older has no problem handling a 50 pound compound bow with 85% let off (7.5 lbs).
- Allowing a mass of crossbows could have a significant impact on wildlife population creating more restrictions and less opportunity for bowhunters.
- Out of 334 general, registration, and draw hunts in the affected region, 320 are non weapon restricted and already allow the use of crossbows as a legal method of take.
- This proposal is obviously meant for non-bowhunters to take advantage of special areas including the Dalton Highway Corridor.
- Allowing less restricted crossbow use in this region could eventually effect our bowhunting opportunities across the state.

Thanks,

Brent

LAW OFFICE OF KNEELAND TAYLOR, P.C.

425 "G" Street, Suite 610
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-276-6219 telephone
907-258-7329 FAX
e-mail: kneelandtaylor@ak.net



PC162
1 of 4

February 20, 2019

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Board Support Section
by email at: dfg.bog.comments@alaska.gov

To the Board of Game:

It is the purpose of this letter to submit comments on proposals to be considered at the Board of Game's Spring Meeting for the Interior and Eastern Arctic Meeting.

I have lived in Alaska for 45 years, raised a family here, and practiced law here for 44 years. I do not hunt or trap, and have advocated for wildlife and non consumptive users for many years. I have served on two Board of Game Subcommittees, and participated in many debates about policy. I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, but am submitting these comments solely on my own behalf.

My comments are as follows:

Proposal 45. Support. This proposal would prohibit the use of moose, caribou and reindeer scent lures in the Interior and Eastern Arctic Region because of the threat of the importation of Chronic Wasting Disease to Alaska. Wildlife is a treasure that Alaskans should zealously protect, and the threat of disease imported from Outside is real. This proposal should be adopted and a statewide ban enacted as well.

Proposal 46. Oppose. Proposal 46 would arbitrarily impose intensive management of bears throughout the region, and if adopted would violate the statutory framework, and serve no purpose.

Proposal 47. Support. This proposal would prohibit non-resident hunting of moose, caribou, and sheep when intensive management programs are underway to increase their populations. Intensive management should be implemented if at

all in extreme emergency circumstances where moose, caribou, sheep and prey species are literally threatened with elimination. Allowing any hunt, less non-resident hunting, is inappropriate in areas where a prey species is threatened with elimination.



Proposal 48. Oppose. This proposal would extend the season for taking wolves in Units 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C by having it start on August 1. Wolves are not vermin, and there is no evidence that the increased take of wolves across all of these numerous game management units is appropriate.

Proposal 51. Oppose. This proposal would allow non-resident sheep hunters over 60 take a sheep every year, for the purported reason that hunters 60+ years old don't have many sheep hunts left before they are too feeble to hunt, or die. This is nonsense. I'm 72 and still climbing mountains in Alaska. I'm not hunting sheep or goats, but I'm still getting up into sheep and goat habitat, and carrying a pack. I like to say that 60 is the new 40. Besides, it is the 60+ year olds who have the money to pay the big bucks to employ guides to carry their gear, and assist with carrying out the kill.

Proposal 55. Oppose. This proposal would authorize the hunting of lynx with hounds. Lynx are a very highly valued species for wildlife viewing. The hunting of lynx with hounds is unsportsmanlike and inhumane. The taking of lynx should be reduced and not increased.

Proposal 56. Support. This proposal would prohibit the placing of traps within a mile of residences. It is a good and timely proposal. No trapper should set large traps near residences, but some do notwithstanding the efforts of trapper organizations to encourage trappers to stay away from developed subdivisions and built up areas. The Municipality of Anchorage in May of 2019, enacted an ordinance prohibiting the placing of traps within 1/4 mile of a permanent dwelling. See Anchorage Municipal Code Title 14, Section 70.200. More than twenty other municipalities have passed trapping bans within their borders: for instance Cordova [by initiative], Homer, and Juneau. The 1/4 mile buffer was copied from a Board of Game enacted regulation relating to trapping in Chugach State Park, and that distance is a reasonable. In recent years the trapping of dogs in the highly populated core area of the MatSu Borough, has sparked public outrage, and substantial social media advocacy. See for instance Alaska Safe Trails on Facebook, with 1.5k likes. The Alaska Trappers Association, and other friends of trapping opposed the passage of Anchorage's ordinance. They focused their attention on the assertion that the issue was for the Board of Game. That assertion failed because of the lengthy history of the BOG ignoring the issue, and because



of the perceived bias of the BOG in favor of trappers. This proposal give Board of Game the opportunity to make itself relevant. The Board should do the right thing, and adopt a regulation providing buffers around permanent dwellings. This proposal should be amended to provide for a buffer of one quarter mile. A larger buffer is not necessary to keep traps out of build up areas. There should be exceptions for the trapping of nuisance animals by authorized officers of federal, state, and local governments; and tribal authorities.

Proposal 119: Oppose. This proposal would extend the season for trapping lynx so that the end of the wolverine and lynx trapping seasons would coincide. Rather than extend the lynx trapping season, the wolverine trapping season should be shortened.

Proposal 63: Oppose. This proposal would modify the regulations applicable to the Dalton Highway Management Area. It appears the intention is to loosen restrictions on the use of motorized vehicle. Restrictions should not be loosened.

Proposal 64: This proposal is a “placeholder” by the Department in an effort to obtain public comment. I oppose loosening restrictions on use of motorized vehicles used for hunting and trapping. I also oppose trapping with snares, leghold traps, and Connibears in the corridor; and oppose the use of firearms to take game in the corridor. Both recreational and subsistence hunters and trappers should not be permitted to hunt and trap in the corridor.

Proposal 152. Support Proposed Closure 1. This proposal would close for some of the year the hunting and trapping of wolves in the Stampede Road corridor west of the Parks Highway. I would prefer closure for the entire year, and this proposal would only close the season from Feb 1 to July 31 for hunting, and from Feb 1 to October 31 for trapping. But I say give it a chance to see if wolf sightings along the Park Road increase to levels seen before the old buffer was repealed. I note that I was on the BOG’s subcommittee on this issue in 2000-2002; and have testified before legislative committees in favor of a much big, full year closure. I think that this issue is the poster child for mismanagement of Alaska’s wildlife and is a powerful symbol of the BOG’s bias, but I am willing to say “give it a try”. I have seen wolves in the Park on back packing trips on several occasions, and I would like to see them again. Further stalemate is not smart.

Proposal 153. Oppose. This proposal would extend the wolverine season to correspond with a shorter lynx trapping season. The lynx season should be shortened instead.

Thank you for considering my comments.



Kneeland Taylor
Kneeland Taylor
2244 Loussac Drive
Anchorage, AK 99517



Submitted By
Don Thomas
Submitted On
2/11/2020 9:14:40 AM
Affiliation
ABA

Phone
406-250-2661

Email
tthomasdon@me.com

Address
1898 Timberlie Rd.
Po Box 939
Lewistown, Montana 59457

I am a former Alaska resident, registered assistant guide, and life member of the Alaska Bowhunters Association. I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 49, to legalize crossbows in certain Alaska Bowhunting-Only areas in the state. A crossbow is not a bow. Those who desire to hunt with one can do so in the general seasons. The ABA already has a proactive program in place to allow legitimately disabled hunters to hunt with modified archery equipment. Age alone is not a criterion. I am 72 years-old and can still draw a longbow or recurve adequate to make clean kills on any big game animals in Alaska, as are many of my friends. I am frankly insulted that my age should be equated with disability. In states in which crossbows have been legalized during bow season that has entirely altered the bowhunting experience and will inevitably lead to more restriction on bow season. Please say no to this horrible idea. If established, it will certainly lead to lobbying for more from the well-financed crossbow lobby. Thank you for your consideration. Don Thomas



Submitted By
Peg Tileston
Submitted On
2/19/2020 9:52:58 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907-561-0540

Email
pegt@gci.net

Address
4780 Cambridge Way
Anchorage, Alaska 99503-7012

I support Proposal 152 to close the area north, east and west of Denali National Park (Units 0607, 0502, and 0502) to hunting and trapping on the following dates: wolf hunting and trapping from February 1 to July 31 and trapping from February 1 to October 31. Over the years of travel into Denali National Park we have experienced a steep decline in the number of times we have seen wolves. This is very depressing and cause for great concern since we and our visitors have been thrilled to see wolves in times past but no longer do. There is much of Alaska open to hunting and trapping. Closing this area is but a drop in the bucket!



Submitted By
Gabe Travis
Submitted On
2/21/2020 6:53:58 AM
Affiliation

To the Board of Game:

I am writing to urge you to support Prproposal 152 to provide seasonal wolf protection north of Denali National Park. I support Closure #1 which is less confusing and easier to administer.

I live in the Wolf townships, off Stampede Road, which borders the closure. Based on the low numbers of Denali's historic Wolf packs and the recent human-caused deaths, I am requesting that the wolf closure be reinstated. A buffer worked well for many, many years. When I first moved to the area, I saw wolves in the park every year for 5 or 6 years. Numbers of sightings have plummeted in recent years and this closure is an attempt to reduce the risk on wolves that venture onto state lands, during those weeks and months from February until summer, when they are consolidating their family groups, mating, and establishing territories, and when the death of a breeding wolf is most damaging to the integrity of the pack.

This pack has special significance in that it has been studied for over 50 years and is a symbol of stellar wildlife research. Please protect this distinctly Alaskan resource, and balance the desires of trappers and non-consumptive users.
Thanks for your consideration.

Gabe Travis, Healy AK



Submitted By
Richard C. Sivils
Submitted On
2/20/2020 3:34:56 PM
Affiliation
Usibelli Coal Mine

Phone
907-347-8998
Email
rsivils@usibelli.com

Address
100 River Road
Healy, Alaska 99743

Usibelli Coal Mine supports proposal 123 in which the Healy management area would be expanded to include the current mining area adjacent to Jumbo Dome. Limiting rifle hunting to areas outside of the active mining areas will ensure worker safety.



Submitted By
Craig Vanarsdale
Submitted On
2/19/2020 7:53:40 PM
Affiliation

My comment is in opposition to Proposal 49. I do not support the use of crossbows during archery seasons.

Submitted By
Craig Vanarsdale
Submitted On
2/19/2020 7:49:49 PM
Affiliation

My comment is in support of Proposal 50 by the Alaska Bowhunters Association. As a member of ABA and a non resident hunter who has hunted Alaska several times I believe this would be a great opportunity for archery hunters.

Submitted By
Craig Vanarsdale
Submitted On
2/19/2020 7:55:57 PM
Affiliation

My comment is in support of Proposal 53 by the Alaska Bowhunters Association. As a member of ABA and a non resident hunter who has hunted Alaska several times I believe this would be a great opportunity for archery hunters.

Submitted By
Craig Vanarsdale
Submitted On
2/19/2020 7:53:40 PM
Affiliation

My comment is in opposition to Proposal 49. I do not support the use of crossbows during archery seasons.



Submitted By
Tom Vanasche
Submitted On
2/16/2020 8:22:29 AM
Affiliation
Professional Bowhunters Society, Pope and Young Club

Phone
5419903946

Email
tomvanasche@mac.com

Address
37731NE Bond Rd
Albany, Oregon 97322

To the Alaska Board of Game: I'm a nonresident who has hunted Alaska a host of times and thank you for that opportunity. I'm on the board of the above mentioned affiliations. In regard to Proposal 50 I encourage a positive response. Weather will be cooler for meat preservation and opportunity will be enhanced for bowhunters, but it can be closely controlled and take can be limited. Proposal 49 should not be allowed. I'm 68 years old and easily use a 62# longbow [took a brown bear recently]. With a 50# compound bow the hunter is only holding 7.5# at full draw. There is already a handicap option in place. Crossbows are effective at 150 yards, shoulder mounted, trigger pulled and affixed with rifle scopes. They are NOT a short range weapon nor are they a bow. They can decimate populations in bow only regions.

Thank you for your attention, Tom Vanasche



Submitted By
Linda Wagner
Submitted On
2/20/2020 3:55:58 PM
Affiliation

~~** NOTE: Resubmitted comment. Earlier Comment did not completely transmit**

My comment is in support of Proposal 152 Closure Option 1 that would close Uniform Coding Units 0607, 0605 and 0502 west of George Parks Highway and bordered on three sides by Denali National Park. These areas would be closed to wolf hunting and trapping from Feb. 1 to July 31 and to trapping from February 1 to October 31. Temporary closings, during the wolf pre-estrus and breeding season, would prevent disruptions or kills to the 2-3 wolf packs Denali tourists view along Park Road. Loss of a pack member can cause a pack to disband. As a visitor to your beautiful state, I most value the wildlife viewing opportunities. As I understand, there are about 2 people a year who have hunted/trapped this area, so close to the park, during the last 20 years. The closure is partial and I hope the BOG recognizes that it will likely prevent a decline in the park wolf population and allow tourists the priceless chance to see a wolf in the wild. Thank you for your consideration.



Submitted By
Mark Wagner
Submitted On
2/21/2020 8:36:44 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-617-0507

Email
Wags@isomedia.com

Address
P.o. box 1170
Wrangell , Alaska 99929

I am opposed to proposal 56 which would ban trapping within one mile of various structures. This proposal among other things is basically an attempt to make Alaska into a huge off leash dog park. There are already too many dogs running around uncontrolled. For some reason many dog owners think they should be free to let their dogs run at large. Too many people don't realize the damage a dog can do; especially to wintering wildlife.



Submitted By
Trevor Wagoner
Submitted On
2/16/2020 1:51:48 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9073945793

Email
trevor.wagoner3@gmail.com

Address
48277 Grant Ave.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

I fully support proposal 50 and 53, **while I do not support 49.**

Proposal 50 and 53 introduce more opportunities for bowhunters to spend time in the mountains without having a significant impact on the game populations. Keeping the animal restrictions to the same standards as rifle hunters will only allow bowhunters to make a small impact while still extending their season.

Proposal 50 will introduce a better scenario for meat harvesting with cooler temperatures in the late season.

Proposal 53 will increase the number of hunters (especially non residents) who will purchase tags and continue to support the causes we all hope to contribute to.

Proposal 49 will have a much larger and negative impact on game populations. The majority of hunters who are 60 and older are more than capable of effectively operating a compound bow and if they are not, they can apply for a Method and Means Exemption. The last thing we want is for populations to go down and for more restrictions to be put in place.

We hope for longer seasons in the mountains and more chances to enjoy and support the animals that are out there.

Trevor Wagoner

Kenai, Alaska



Submitted By
Angela Walk
Submitted On
2/17/2020 7:32:00 AM
Affiliation

Proposal 50 & 53- I support the 10 day archery only registration hunt for bull moose and dall sheep which allows bowhunters a greater opportunity to harvest an animal. Bowhunters do not have the long range advantage that rifle hunters do and the additional time added to the current seasons would greatly enhance bowhunters experience in the field. Due to the nature of bowhunting and the lower harvest rates the additional hunt days should not have much impact on total game harvest and game populations. As a non-resident any additional time in the field is greatly appreciated. Non-residents generate additional revenues for the state of Alaska for not only the fish and game department but for resident outfitters and communities visited. Thank you for considering these special extended hunting dates for bow hunters.



Submitted By
Todd Walter
Submitted On
2/21/2020 1:22:45 PM
Affiliation

In regards to Proposal 56.

I Agree that in certain areas trapping should be limited, however this is entirely too encompassing. I understand that to properly address the situation would take time and effort. That does not warrant locking up thousands upon thousands of acres currently being trapped responsibly.

In my opinion this is a knee jerk response to a combination of irresponsible dog owners and what some would label trappers. Understand that making something against the law will not prevent the problem from continuing to occur.

Thank you for your time.



Submitted By
Bill Watkins
Submitted On
2/19/2020 8:24:20 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907-351-9740
Email
Watkinsnp@hotmail.com

Address
3105 Lakeshore Drive, #B235
Anchorage , Alaska 99517

February 19, 2020

Dear Alaska Board of Game Members,

I would ask the Alaska Board of Game to reject Proposal 152 as it is currently written because I believe it will have little to no positive effect on Denali's wolves or on the visitor viewing of them.

What I do support is to amend Proposal 152 with the amendments from Alaskans for Wildlife and Richard Steiner which would enact the following:

1. Closed area enlarged, to align with that which was passed by the Alaska House of Representatives in HB 105 (in 2017);
2. A year-round closure;
3. Prohibit take of all predator species (wolves, brown bear, black bear, lynx, wolverine, coyote)

I have worked in Denali for the past 33 years and drive the Tundra Wilderness Tours into the park and know first hand, the interest and excitement that up to 52 visitors (both Alaskan & out of state) have when wolves are viewed.

There is significant interest in wolves, but the current situation where a handful of trappers and hunters can target and kill and consequently subvert the protections of Denali National Park has had a serious impact on visitor viewing and their overall experience.

Last summer, I conducted two driver's surveys (the first was reported in both the Anchorage Daily News and the Fairbanks Daily News Miner) with the results of the first being:

See:

<https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/science/2019/07/29/looking-to-see-a-wolf-at-denali-a-grassroots-bus-driver-survey-puts-the-odds-at-not-quite-nonexistent/>

http://www.newsminer.com/features/outdoors/battle-over-wolf-hunting-on-denali-boundary-continues/article_25332818-b74c-11e9-9f0a-d71e8965fe25.html

1st Survey Results:

Covering 75 days (April 27 - July 10)

15 Wolf Sightings

20 Wolves

43 reporting drivers/employees

The second survey took place from September 2-8 and was not reported in the press:

Subtotal for End of Season Survey:

63 people responded; 21 Wolf Sightings 25 Wolves

Totals (without any duplication) that includes both End of Season & Mid Season Survey Results

(135 Days):



Total number of people who responded in: 68

Total number of wolf sightings from April 27 through September 8th, 2019: 27

Total number of wolves viewed from April 27 through September 8th, 2019: 32

The drivers that responded to both surveys drive various lengths of the park road including: Front Country (to Mile 14.5), Denali Natural History Tours (to Mile 25), Tundra Wilderness Tour (to Mile 62), Transportation System (to Miles 53, 66, 87, & 92) and Kantishna Lodge drivers who drive the full length of the park road (92 miles) to Kantishna.

For myself and my passengers, I had zero sightings for the entire summer - which was the first in years; possibly ever that I didn't see a wolf. In fact, I had two wolverine sightings last year (7-8 sightings in 33 years), which are considered the rarest major wildlife sighting in Denali - which makes last year's lack of wolf sightings all the more bizarre.

NPS would later confirm our snapshot driver's surveys and state that wolf sightings had declined to 1% from a high of 44% in 2010 when we had the partial, yet inadequate Buffer in the Wolf Townships.

Ideally, the best way to determine where a Buffer or not, leads to significant increases in wolf sightings and improves the visitor experience is to put in place a large enough Buffer that effectively protects Denali's wolves on a year round basis.

The previous partial Buffer was in place for 10 years from 2000-2010; a Buffer that incorporates all of the Wolf Townships, on a year round basis for at least 10 years should determine whether visitor viewing improves or not.

After 10 years, data collected on visitor viewing/experience, wolf family group natural stability (as stable as wolf family groups can be), the establishment and stability of family group habits/behavior: den & rendezvous sites, hunting/travel habits, territory and their use of the park road can be evaluated and compared to both the partial Buffer from 2000-2010 and the no Buffer from 2010-2020 to determine differences and help in further management decisions.

Only by doing such a full scientific evaluation and comparison of partial Buffer, no Buffer, to full year round Buffer can it be determined the full importance of a protected Buffer (or not) to the wolves and to the visitor viewing experience.

Lastly, two years ago I started a Facebook Group site called: Denali Wolves that covers this issue in detail and will continue to do so. Currently, we have 309 members who are very interested in this issue and wish to see the park wolves protected (year round) within the Wolf Townships and the visitor experience enhanced with wolf viewing opportunities.

I fully realize that wolf viewing can never be guaranteed in even the best of circumstances but the stage can be set for their possibility. Currently, there is little if any possibility of this occurring on a consistent basis for the long term.

Please consider and pass the Amended Proposal 152 - with the amendments from Richard Steiner & Alaskans for Wildlife.

Sincerely,

Bill Watkins



Submitted By
Brian Watkins
Submitted On
2/6/2020 10:05:01 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9072311060
Email
brian.watkins@honeywell.com
Address
18131 hidden falls ave
Eagle river, Alaska 99577

I support proposal 48. There is a declining sheep and caribou population in these units. Hunters are afield prior to the current August 10th start date, and often run into wolves during that time. Caribou season starts aug 1 and sheep hunters are getting into the field earlier every year. Extending the date to aug 1 will allow for those hunters to harvest wolves and lower predation on said animals

Submitted By
Brian Watkins
Submitted On
2/6/2020 9:22:21 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9072311060
Email
brian.watkins@honeywell.com
Address
18131 hidden falls ave
Eagle river, Alaska 99577

I oppose Proposal 71 to allow baiting of Grizzly/Brown Bears in Unit 24A. Unit 24A is road accessible via the Dalton Highway and provides a pristine environment to hunt both Brown/Grizzly Bears and Black Bears with archery equipment. There are many Grizzly bears in this unit and allowing hunters to bait them would congregate them into prime moose calving grounds when they are most vulnerable. Additionally, this area receives little pressure from hunters in the spring and if baiting is allowed for grizzly bears there stands to be a significant increase in activity, hunter conflict, etc. There are many units that allow Brown/Grizzly Bear baiting but none of them are nearly as accessible or pristine as the DHCMA portion of Unit 24A. If the Department feels the need for an increased harvest in this particular area, there are other means to achieve that, such as allowing for a 2 bear harvest.





Submitted By
Erica R Watson
Submitted On
2/21/2020 11:00:26 AM
Affiliation
none

My name is Erica Watson, and I've lived near Denali National Park, at mile 230 of the Parks Highway, since 2009, and seasonally for several years prior.

I'm writing in support of Proposal 152, closure 1, as submitted by the National Park Service. This proposal exercises the State's authority to manage for multiple uses, allowing for the continued health of the regional wolf populations, one of the most valuable in the state both economically and ecologically.

Over the years I've worked in and around Denali National Park, in science education, food service, and other sectors, and talked to countless visitors who chose to spend their money here because of the opportunity to see wolves in a place not dominated by human activities. Through decades of research on Denali's wolf populations, we know that their seasonal movements include state and federally managed lands, and management should be based in this extensive research. The scientific value of a healthy wolf population is immeasurable - local research has informed decisions around the continent- and this proposal offers an opportunity for compatible state and federal policies that serve the Park's gateway communities as a scientific and economic resource, while still allowing for hunting and trapping during the fall and winter months.



Submitted By
Robert and Karen Watson
Submitted On
2/12/2020 8:02:23 AM
Affiliation

Phone
574-656-8719

Email
bob@bobwatsonphotography.com

Address
25945 New Rd.
North Liberty, Indiana 46554

1. Proposal 152 will provide enhanced protection for those wolves that leave Denali National Park onto state lands in the Stampede townships in late winter and spring, and then return to the park for denning, pupping and summer activities. Proposal 152 is limited to those lands where the greatest amount of data on wolf movements has been gathered over the years. There are two options: We support Closure 1, the larger map, as it is less confusing and easier to administer.

2. Management for conservation of wolves is not practiced on most state lands, but the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game have the authority to manage in this way, authority that is derived from statute and internal policy. Management for conservation makes sense in this area, where more than 40 years of research (the Denali Wolf Program) has revealed detailed information on the life habits of wolves and where a large constituency of Alaskans supports conservation of wolves, for science, for viewing, and for their value to the ecosystem.

3. Proposal 152 retains hunter-trapper opportunity between Aug 10th and Feb 1st, and removes it between Feb 1st and August 10th. It splits the year between the interests of hunter-trappers and the interests of non-consumptive users. It is an attempt to reduce the risk on wolves that venture onto state lands, during those weeks and months from February until summer, when they are consolidating their family groups, mating, and establishing territories, and when the death of a breeding wolf is most damaging to the integrity of the pack.



Submitted By
Jay Wattenbarger
Submitted On
2/13/2020 8:57:50 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9074902857
Email
jkellyw@hotmail.com
Address
PO Box 10454
Two Rivers, Alaska 99710

I support the following proposals:

47,48,52,54,55,61,62,63,64,67,68,69,74,75,76,80,82,83,86,88,89,93,96,104,106,129,146,149,151,
153.

I oppose the following proposals: 51,53,56,58,65,81,87,108,115,136,152



Submitted By
Gary Weaver
Submitted On
2/8/2020 2:17:07 PM
Affiliation

Phone
727-754-0470
Email
weaverg12@gmail.com

Address
1512 Valarian Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

As an Alaskan bowhunter I am in favor of proposals 50 and 53.

If proposal 50 were enacted as a registration hunt with the same antler restrictions there is no reason to assume there would be any more success by archers than in any other archery only season in any other unit. The temperatures in the late fall are much cooler, diminishing the threat of waste from heat. There is a potential increase in revenue from outfitters, guides, air taxis, taxidermists, shipping companies, hotels, and other tourist based businesses because of the extended hunting season for archers.

Proposal 53 should be enacted because of the minimal impact that archers have on the dall sheep population. The efficacy of archery equipment while hunting dall sheep is low, so an archery only season opener would be beneficial in giving archery only hunters a block of time before the mountains are plugged with rifle hunters. Making it a registration hunt would let ADF&G closely monitor the take of mature rams in their respective units. Keeping the same horn restrictions keeps the take of the older age class consistent. Again, there is a potential increase in revenue from outfitters, guides, air taxis, taxidermists, shipping companies, hotels, and other tourist based businesses because of the extended hunting season for archers.

As an archery hunter, I am vehemently against proposal 49. Crossbows are a legal means of take in 320 of the 334 of the hunts/hunting areas in the state. This proposal appears to be an attempt to take away an archery only hunting corridor along the Dalton Highway. Furthermore, the minimum draw weight required to bowhunt in Alaska is 50 pounds. Most bows have an 85% let off, so the person is only holding 7.5 pounds at full draw. This feat is still easy for a senior that is 60 years or older. If a person shows true disability in drawing a bow, there are already statutes in place (Methods and Means of Exemption) that allow them to hunt with a crossbow during archery only seasons. This intrusion to an archery only hunting area will only lead to more intrusion into archery only hunting areas in other parts of the state.



Submitted By
kate weber
Submitted On
2/12/2020 7:15:00 AM
Affiliation

Phone
8143236804
Email
kweber93@yahoo.com
Address
PO BOX 597
Healy , Alaska 99743

I am writing as a resident in Healy since I bought my land 15 yrs ago. I also lived right outside the Denali Nat Park in the late 70s. At that time things were pristine and nature abounded. Wolves could be seen out in the park. Both Murie and Haber did extensive research.

NOW We have a 3 bears Alaska owned store that sells the AR15. So it is common to hear gunshots by air bnb guest right out on dry creek. This hobby of shooting and killing things.

Now when tourists come from all over the world to see beautiful nature they see that America most loves shooting and killing things and that is what is to do now. KILL THE WOLVES. These are not broke people who need to have 15 wolf pelts in their garage of oil weath anyway.

My own truck gets shot sometimes. But there are no wolves to see by any tourists anymore. Instead they look for mice and varmits left from the endless buses and endless priviledged vehicleless spewing fumes enough to drive any bicycle or cross country ski er or animal.

SO I
SUPPORT Closure 1. proposal 152. I support allowing wolves this closure time because we know the habits and killing is NOT what tourists or me enjoy about a national park at all.

BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

Alaska Board of Game, Boards Support Section
Comments to: 2019/2020 Proposed Changes
to Regulations Interior and Eastern
Arctic Region.

Submitted by: Brian West
1000 Oceanview Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99515

Proposal 45. SUPPORT.

Proposal 46. SUPPORT.

Proposal 47. OPPOSE. The stated issue is that some older hunters are too feeble to use traditional archery equipment and should therefore be allowed to use cross bows in archery only hunts. If these people are incapable of using a bow they are likely incapable of performing all the other activities involved in hunting. Additionally, bow hunting is not so much about filling ones freezer as indicated, but, more about the experience as bow hunting is more likely to end in failure compared to using a rifle. A cross bow is significantly different from other archery equipment and should not be allowed in archery only hunts.



Comments to: 2019 / 2020 Prop. Changes to Reg
Interior and Eastern Arctic Regions.

Submitted by: Brian West

Proposal 50. OPPOSE. There is no reason to have a specific archery hunt. Anyone wishing to hunt with a bow can do so during the general season. The hunt area is not so crowded. There is no need for the department of Fish & Game to incur this additional expense.

Proposal 52. OPPOSE. In general, I strongly believe Residents should always have priority over non-residents. However, in this instance, there is a general hunt so Alaskans are not being shut out. The issue is that non-residents take a majority of the sheep. The reason is they use guides. If Alaskans want to increase their odds of a successful sheep hunt they should employ guides or outfitters and not complain about those who do.

Proposal 53. OPPOSE. The general hunt allows for bow hunting. There is no need to carve out another special interest hunt. Furthermore, allowing this hunt before the general hunt will decrease the ~~odds~~ success rate of hunters during the general season as hunters will have been in the field chasing the sheep around.



Comments to: 2019/2020 Prop. Changes to Regs
Interior and Eastern Arctic Regions.

Submitted By: Brian West

Proposal 84. **OPPOSE.** Area is archery only and I see no actual reason for extending the sheep season. It is possible that snow fall will make the sheep easier to hunt, that may be the reason for the proposal.

Proposal 85. **OPPOSE,**

Proposal 87, **OPPOSE.** Changing to a drawing hunt will have no effect on the length of the season. The hunt area has large numbers of animals, easily accessible along highways and very open country making them easy to spot. Because of these factors and that the migration occurs rapidly people congregate in relatively small areas at one time. Because of this the hunt will almost always close early by emergency order. Nothing is worse than having a permit and thinking you can go whenever you want only to have the hunt close. The very fact that the hunt closes quickly limits the number of people willing to hunt. Additionally, a drawing hunt with a longer proposed season will increase the pressure on the moose population. Right now the season ends before the moose season.



Submitted by Brian West
Comments to 2019/2020 Prop Changes to Regs
Interior and Eastern Arctic Regions.

Proposal 90. OPPOSE. Non-residents should be able to hunt with family members.

Proposal 92 OPPOSE. I am appalled that such an exemption exists. ATV use in a non-motorized area fundamentally alters the very concept of a non-motorized hunt area. It would not be protected by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Additionally, the State makes other accommodations by allowing the use of ATV on millions of acres of State land. The disabled can also make use of horses or bicycles. Allowing the use of ATV in a non-motorized area destroys the hunting experience of every other user. With so many acres available to ATV use their use in non-motorized areas should be eliminated.

Proposal 109. OPPOSE. Changing from harvest ticket to registration permit will have no effect. People either care about the animals they hunt and the laws established to provide for continued hunting or they don't. Enforcement with the penalty being the loss of hunting privileges is what is required. Local residents should be assisting the Troopers in this matter.

Proposal 112. OPPOSE



Comments to 2019/2020 Prop Changes to Regs
Interior and Eastern Arctic Regions

Submitted by: Brian West

Proposal 129. OPPOSE. Hay and other feed used to feed animals used for hunting is hunting gear.

Proposal 130. SUPPORT. See comments to proposal 92.

Proposal 131. SUPPORT.

Proposal 133. OPPOSE. I do not agree with the establishment of special hunting privileges. If increased hunting pressure is a problem a more effective solution would be to limit ATV access.

Proposal 134 OPPOSE. There is no reason to approve this hunt. Why do special interest groups always want to be allowed to hunt first?

Proposal 136. OPPOSE



Comments to 2019/2020 Prop. Changes to
Regs Interior and Eastern Arctic Regions

Submitted by Brian West

Proposal 137. SUPPORT

Proposal 138. OPPOSE. There are numerous
archery hunts in Unit 20B.

Proposal 146. SUPPORT WITH CHANGES. There
should be no permits given to non-residents.
If a hunt is restricted so that residents
must have a permit then there should be
no permits given to non-residents. It is
deplorable that residents go wanting yet a
non-resident can obtain a permit. The
Board does a disservice to Alaskans when
they allow this. It is shameful.

Proposal 152. SUPPORT



Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
c/o Office of Subsistence Management
1011 East Tudor Road MS 121
Anchorage, Alaska 99503-6199
Phone: (907) 787-3888, Fax: (907) 786-3898
Toll Free: 1-800-478-1456

DEC 26 2019

RAC 19051.KD

Ted Spraker
Chair
Alaska Board of Game
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Re: Proposal #59 Support as Amended

Dear Chairman Spraker:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (Council) to provide a modification to Proposal 59 submitted by the Council to the Alaska Board of Game (BOG) for its Interior and Eastern Arctic Region meeting scheduled for March 6-14, 2020 in Fairbanks.

The Council represents subsistence harvesters of fish and wildlife resources on Federal public lands and waters of the Western Interior Region of Alaska. As you know, the Councils were established by authority in Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), and chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Section 805 of ANILCA established the Council's authority to initiate, review, and evaluate proposals for regulations, policies, management plans, and other matters related to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife within the region. The Council also reviews resource management actions occurring outside its region that may affect subsistence resources critical to communities served by the Council. The Council provides a forum for the expression of opinions and recommendations regarding any matter related to the subsistence uses of fish and wildlife within the region.

Following its March 26-27, 2019 meeting in Fairbanks, the Council submitted proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board (WP20-37) and BOG (Proposal 59) to add a December to-be-announced moose season in Unit 21D – that portion south of the south bank of the Yukon River, downstream of the up-river entrance of Kala Slough and west of Kala Creek.

At its October 8-9, 2019 meeting in McGrath, the Council unanimously voted to modify Federal subsistence proposal WP20-37 and BOG proposal 59 to define the proposed December hunt area for Unit 21D as that area southeast of Kaiyuh Slough and Nine-Mile Camp to Bonanza Creek



Spraker

2

Drainage to the Kaiyuh Mountains, and south to the Unit 21D boundary. The Council discussed the extremely low bull to cow ratio of 10 bulls per 100 cows near the community of Galena, and wanted to ensure that this area was not included in the December hunt. The modified hunt area for both Federal and State regulations would allow for harvest in the high-density moose area with good bull to cow ratio while applying conservation measures where needed on Federal and State lands in the unit. Aligning these regulations would also reduce confusion for local subsistence hunters.

We appreciate the BOG's consideration of this amendment to Proposal 59 and look forward to continuing discussions with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the BOG on subsistence matters affecting the region. If you have questions about this letter, please contact me through Karen Deatherage, Subsistence Council Coordinator, with the Office of Subsistence Management, at (907) 474-2270 or Karen_deatherage@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

Jack Reakoff
Chair

cc: Thomas Doolittle, Acting Assistant Regional Director
Office of Subsistence Management
Greg Risdahl, Acting Deputy Assistant Regional Director
Office of Subsistence Management
Suzanne Worker, Acting Policy Coordinator, Office of Subsistence Management
George Pappas, State Subsistence Liaison, Office of Subsistence Management
Theo Matuskowitz, Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management
Tom Kron, Acting Council Coordination Division Supervisor
Office of Subsistence Management
Karen Deatherage, Council Coordinator, Office of Subsistence Management
Chris McKee, Wildlife Division Supervisor, Office of Subsistence Management
Lisa Maas, Wildlife Biologist, Office of Subsistence Management
Benjamin Mulligan, Deputy Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Mark Burch, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Administrative Record



Submitted By
Jeffrey Wieber
Submitted On
2/12/2020 9:34:17 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9072909103
Email
jawieber77@gmail.com
Address
7221 E 21st
#2
ANCHORAGE, Alaska 99504

Support [Proposal #47](#) (RHAK) – Prohibit nonresident hunting of any prey species under Intensive Management predation control until the herd reaches population or harvest objectives

Support [Proposal #52](#) (RHAK) - Change general season nonresident sheep hunts in units 20A and 19C to draw permit only with a limited allocation

Support [Proposal #62](#) (RHAK) – Allocate 90 percent of the Upper Nowitna Unit 21B moose draw permits to residents

Support [Proposal #64](#) (ADF&G) - Clarify the legal use of highway vehicles, snowmachines and off-road vehicles in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA)

Support Proposals 67- 73 have to do with increasing brown bear bag limits, allowing the take of brown bear over bait, and elimination of a registration hunt for brown bear

Oppose [Proposal #77](#) (Nick Muche) - Open a resident permit hunt for muskox in Unit 26B

Support [Proposal #79](#) (Fairbanks Advisory Committee) - Increase resident hunting opportunity for Central Arctic Herd in Unit 26B Remainder

Support [Proposal #80](#) (RHAK) - Increase resident hunting opportunity for the Central Arctic Herd (CAH) in Unit 26B Remainder

Oppose [Proposal #81](#) (Howard Tieden) Increase nonresident bag limit of the Central Arctic Herd in Unit 26B

Support [Proposal #82](#) (Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council) - Establish an Arctic Village Sheep Management Area in unit 25A and open a new resident and nonresident drawing hunt

Neutral [Proposal #83](#) (Lenny Jewkes) - Modify the bag limit for sheep in the RS595 subsistence hunt

Support [Proposal #129](#) (RHAK) - Change the closure dates for the Yanert Controlled Use Area (CUA) in unit 20A to align with the Wood River CUA, and clarify whether hay to feed horses is "hunting gear."



Submitted By
Sandy R Williams
Submitted On
2/18/2020 9:24:42 PM
Affiliation

Please support proposal 152 to help the wolves at Denali Nat. Pk. stay alive and have their pups, and so the tourists can see more wolves in the area, this should not impact the hunters and trappers. Thanks Sandy



Submitted By
Ruth Wood
Submitted On
2/17/2020 1:02:46 PM
Affiliation
self

Phone
9077336874
Email
Gingerandmagic@yahoo.com
Address
15406 E Barge Dr
P. O. Box 766
Talkeetna, Alaska 99676

I am writing in support of Proposal 152, Closure 1.

I am an Alaskan resident who has been fortunate enough to visit Denali National Park (DNP) and observe wolves in the Park. Seeing wolves in the Park is a highlight of any trip there for me and for other visitors. There is no guarantee that one will see a wolf, but if the pack is eliminated, there is no chance.

The map for Closure 1 would close an area surrounded by the Park. Furthermore, the closure would only be for part of the year, and would affect only a handful of wolf hunters/trappers.

Denali National Park did the research that the Board of Game needed, and the results show that this closure would be beneficial to the wolves of Denali National Park.

This proposal is not meant to, and would not, prevent hunting and trapping of wolves in the entire state. It will protect the DNP wolves that venture out of the Park along the Stampede trail and then come back into the Park.

Proposal 152, Closure 1 has the potential for enhancing visitor experience, but it is important to have these wolves for the ongoing scientific research that began decades ago.

I urge you to adopt Proposal 152, Closure 1.



Submitted By
Birch Yuknis
Submitted On
2/20/2020 10:33:45 AM
Affiliation

Alaska Board of Game Members,

02/20/2020

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments today. I am a born (1971) and raised Alaskan. I currently reside in Wasilla where I have operated a small business since 1999. I have hunted all over the State by pretty much all available means of transportation. I do currently serve on the Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee but I write to you today for myself.

Proposal 45 I SUPPORT this proposal. I would ask that the BOG clarify if this will include synthetic urine as well or not.

Proposal 50 I OPPOSE this proposal. There are currently generous opportunities to harvest moose in this area without creating a special hunt for a specific user group. In addition this would allow this special user group to have the opportunity to harvest during the peak of the rut when the bulls can be particularly stupid.

Proposal 53 I OPPOSE this proposal. The current sheep season is already 42 days. How much opportunity does one need? This special hunt would also coincide with the youth hunt and I do not want the youth to have to compete with archers. This and the other bow oriented hunt proposals are not about harvest but opportunity.

Proposal 58 I OPPOSE this proposal. I do not agree with denying a user group access when there is no biological concern. The BOG does not need to be making special locals only hunts.

Proposal 74 I OPPOSE this proposal. This hunt, if implemented should be a drawing hunt available online to all hunters. Preferably resident hunters.

Proposal 77 I OPPOSE this proposal. Please see my comments to proposal 74.

Proposal 83 I OPPOSE this proposal. If you choose to believe Wayne Heimer's beliefs that removing full curl or 8 year or older rams from the population will not hurt said population then the BOG should be changing this proposal to actually increase the ram size not decrease it.

Proposal 84 I OPPOSE this proposal. Again how much opportunity does one need? 42 days is a very long season. This is about opportunity and not harvest. I do not agree with making special hunts for special user groups when there is already a generous opportunity.

Proposal 85 I OPPOSE this proposal. Please see my comments to proposal 84.

Proposal 90 I OPPOSE this proposal. A nonresident is a nonresident. Why would the BOG want to decrease an opportunity for a resident to hunt with a 2DK family member?

Proposal 138 I OPPOSE this proposal. Again a special hunt for a specific user group when there is already plenty of opportunity currently available. The author even states "during the most productive time of the season." This author wants to have a special season during the prime part of the season.

Proposal 152 I OPPOSE this proposal. The Park is big enough.

In closing, at this meeting there are several bow hunting only proposals. The bow hunters will talk allot about how their successful harvest rates are minimal. What we do is called hunting and not called harvesting. These proposals seek to create special opportunities to hunt for a specific user group when there are already very generous opportunities available. I am sure each and everyone of you have a memory of a great hunt that you did not harvest on. It was the opportunity on that hunt that made that hunt so special. This State is very generous already with the seasons in place.

Thank you for your time,

Birch Yuknis



Submitted By
Mary Zalar
Submitted On
2/21/2020 12:45:58 PM
Affiliation
Individual

Phone
9073881740

Email
zalar49@gmail.com

Address
1940 Becker Ridge Rd
Fairbanks, Alaska 99709

I support Closure 1 of Proposal 152 which prohibits the taking of wolves in a portion of Unit 20C at specific times. I do not believe there is a biological imperative to support or reject this proposal, so it is a decision based on values and how to benefit the most users/people. The majority of our residents are wildlife viewers, and a minority are hunters or trappers. VERY few individuals utilize the proposed area for trapping. Tens to hundreds of thousands of individuals visit Denali National Park to view wildlife among other things. I would much rather limit human predation on wolves in this area in order to benefit the many who value wildlife conservation and wildlife viewing opportunities.