

Submitted By
Ian Reid
Submitted On
2/18/2022 9:42:46 PM
Affiliation



PC151
1 of 1

Hello,

I am writing in support of Proposal 199. There needs to be more separation between frequently used recreational trails in and near more populated areas of the state including but not limited to: Mat Su, Fairbanks, Anchorage, Turnagain Arm, Seward, Kenai, Soldotna, Juneau, Kodiak, etc.

Peoples pets have been accidentally caught, maimed and or killed in traps in numerous areas of the state for years. With so many people getting outside more as a result of the pandemic, it is more important than ever to create safer separation between trapping, traplines etc and where the general public recreates.

Thank you very much for your consideration of adopting Proposal 199.

Ian Reid / Anchorage



unapologetically **FOR ALASKAN RESIDENTS**

PO Box 60095, Fairbanks, Alaska 99706 (907) 371-7436
email info@residenthuntersofalaska.org web www.residenthuntersofalaska.org

February 17, 2022

**Comments to Alaska Board of Game
Statewide Meeting
March 4 – 12, 2022**

Proposals we support: 103, 111, 119, 120, 135-137, 151, 168, 193, 239, 241, 243, 267

Proposals we oppose: 112, 140, 141, 146, 149, 173, 230

Definitions

Proposal 103 – 5AAC 92.990 Clarify whether hay and grain are considered as “hunting gear”

SUPPORT to define that hay and grain should *not* be considered as hunting gear

This proposal stems from a RHAK proposal regarding motorized access prohibitions in controlled use areas that deem hay and grain as “hunting gear” that are not allowed to be transported under those CUA restrictions.

A hunter was cited for using motorized access to transport hay and grain for his horses prior to hunting season under the current definitions. We do not believe that hay and grain should be considered “hunting gear” under any regulations.

Proposal 230 – 5 AAC 92.990(a)(30). Definitions.

Change 5 AAC 92.990 “full-curl horn” of a male (ram) Dall sheep from “at least eight years of age” to “at least seven years of age” as determined by horn growth annuli.

OPPOSE

We have concerns that too many sub-legal sheep are being harvested, and that this proposed change would affect sheep conservation and sustainability.

Falconry

Proposal 111 – 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry.

Limit nonresident take of raptors to one bird every four years and limit unsuccessful permittees from applying the following year.

SUPPORT



Draw permits for certain coveted big game species have limits on how often one can apply after being drawn, and how often one can hunt after being successful. This proposal seeks to do the same for nonresident falconry capture permits, which are highly coveted and sought after, giving a fairer chance to all to draw a permit and successfully capture a falcon.

Proposal 112 – 5 AAC 92.037. Permits for falconry.

Increase nonresident opportunity for acquiring raptors.

OPPOSE

This proposal asks for too much, would have no quotas for nonresident capture of eyas birds from the nest. Nonresidents do not deserve the same opportunities as residents; if they wish to have those same opportunities, they are welcome to move to Alaska.

Proxy Hunting

Proposal 119 – 5 AAC 92.011(k). Taking of game by proxy.

Include muskox on the list of species that can be taken under a proxy permit.

SUPPORT

Muskox are an important source of food for residents in NW Alaska, and when in Tier II and destruction of trophy value is required, there is no reason not to allow proxy hunting of those animals so those unable to hunt have a means to better acquire meat.

Unlawful Methods

Proposals 135-137 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Repeal the restriction on spotting sheep from aircraft during hunting season.

SUPPORT

We have always opposed the board-generated Proposal 207 restricting the use of aircraft to spot sheep during the open sheep hunting season, and we support its repeal. This restriction came about as a board-generated proposal without any public requests for such a restriction, and was widely opposed by the public, various organizations, and numerous Advisory Committees. The Alaska Wildlife Troopers have said all along that it is unenforceable.

The restriction on spotting sheep from an aircraft is a danger to proper piloting of an aircraft under certain conditions and can lead to ethical hunters foregoing a sheep hunt when flying into an area and seeing sheep while looking for a place to land.



Alaska's same-day-airborne regulation already restricts someone spotting a sheep from the air and then hunting the same day they were airborne. This additional restriction serves no real purpose.

Permits for Bear Baiting

Proposal 140 – 5 AAC 92.044 (b)(4). Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

Increase the number of bait station sites temporarily from 10 to 20 per guide use area.

OPPOSE

This proposal asks to double the number of bait stations a guide could have in each guide use area, and asks that this proposal if passed be temporary, but does not specify any specific length of time for it to be in regulation.

Some guides have adjacent guide use areas across rivers in which they set up to 10 bait stations on one side of the river and 10 bait stations on the other side. Resident hunters who are not guides are allowed up to 2 bait stations statewide, and we already have competition and conflict issues finding a place to set up a station and with bait stations being close together. Allowing guides to have 20 bait stations per guide use area would further exacerbate these issues.

Proposal 236 – 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

Require ADF&G to notify bear bait station registrants of other bait stations within a one-mile radius of desired bait station location.

SUPPORT

We continue to have conflicts surrounding bear bait stations being in proximity which in part arise because hunters are unaware of where other bait stations are located when they register for a permit. The Department does not give out bait station locations to the public, nor does the Department (see proposal 237) notify registrants whether the location of their bait station is legal according to regulations in terms of being too close in proximity to another dwelling, publicly maintained road or trail.

Not providing information as to proximity of other bait stations when registering causes unnecessary conflicts and crowding. We understand the names of bait station registrants along with locations is not allowed to be made public, and this proposal isn't asking for that information to be made public. What this proposal seeks to address is simply informing hunters when they register and submit the location information of their station, to be informed whether or not is within a ¼ mile, ½ mile, or a mile from another site. That information would help to decrease crowding of bait stations and conflicts among hunters.

Proposal 237 – 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.



Clarify that ADF&G will not issue permits to use bait or scent lures near prohibited areas already defined in regulation.

SUPPORT

Hunters who register for a bear bait station with the Department should not be held legally liable when the Department issues them a bait station permit for a bait station that falls within proximity boundaries to a dwelling, maintained road, trail, or public facility that make that bait station illegal.

The responsibility to ensure bait stations fall within legal boundaries as outlined in regulation should fall on the agency that issues the permit.

Hunting and Other Permits

Proposal 146 – 5 AAC 92.052. Discretionary permit hunt conditions and procedures.

Limit big game registration permits to one per species, per year.

OPPOSE

This proposal centers on goats yet would apply to all registration hunts for all species. We do not see how having multiple registration hunt permits for a single species during a calendar year negatively impacts the resource or hunt opportunities. In areas with quotas, once the quota is reached the hunt is shut down.

Some registration hunts for moose, for example, are for earlier seasons in southcentral, and some are for later seasons in the interior. There is nothing at all wrong, nor does it take away opportunity from others or threaten the resource, if a hunter picks up a registration permit for an August moose hunt, is not successful, then wants to pick up a permit for a later September moose registration hunt.

Proposal 149 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts.

Create separate Dall sheep permit draw for second-degree-kindred hunters in areas that limit the number of nonresident hunters.

OPPOSE

Alaska's "must-be-guided" law, AS 16.05.407, does ***not*** differentiate between nonresident U.S. citizen hunters who are guided and those who hunt with a resident relative within second-degree-of-kindred (2DK). However, for many years now, the Board of Game has differentiated between those two groups of nonresident hunters in order to provide more opportunity to guides, at the expense of nonresidents wishing to hunt with a family member as their guide. On Kodiak Island, the Board has placed nonresident 2DK hunters in the resident pool of coveted brown bear tags. This is completely contrary to the intent of AS 16.05.407.



Resident Hunters of Alaska Proposal 241 seeks to do the opposite of this proposal, by requiring the board to treat all nonresident U.S. citizen hunters equally, as outlined in AS 16.05.407. Nonresident U.S. citizens who hunt with a licensed guide should not have any more, or less, opportunity to hunt than a nonresident who hunts with a 2DK Alaskan relative as their guide.

AS 16.05.407. Nonresident Hunting Big Game Animals Must Be Accompanied.

(a) It is unlawful for a nonresident to hunt, pursue, or take brown bear, grizzly bear, mountain goat, or sheep in this state, unless personally accompanied by

(1) a person who is licensed as

(A) a registered guide-outfitter or a master guide-outfitter under AS [08.54](#) and who is providing big game hunting services to the nonresident under a contract with the nonresident; or

(B) a class-A assistant guide or an assistant guide under AS [08.54](#) and who is employed by a registered guide-outfitter or a master guide-outfitter who has a contract to provide big game hunting services to the nonresident; or

(2) a resident over 19 years of age who is

(A) the spouse of the nonresident; or

(B) related to the nonresident, within and including the second degree of kindred, by marriage or blood.

Proposal 151 – 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts. 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.

Require all hunters to apply for permit hunts and pay the application fee during the application period.

SUPPORT

This is a Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK) proposal addressing how nonresident must-be-guided draw permits for brown bear and moose on federal USFWS Refuge lands are chosen and allocated.

The Board has created a loophole whereby nonresident must-be-guided draw permits on Refuge lands don't have to be applied for or go through the same "lottery" system that resident hunters go through with low odds of drawing a permit, nor do nonresident must-be-guided hunters have to pay a draw-hunt application fee or have their names in the public record as residents do.

These must-be-guided draw permits on USFWS lands are actually allocated to the individual guides with exclusive guide concessions on those federal lands, to do with them as the guide wishes. Some guides choose not to utilize the permits allocated to his or her concession area. Many guides make deals with clients prior to the draw hunt application period, have signed guide-client agreements, and then the client just shows up in Alaska and picks up an over-the-counter tag from the Department.

As we state in our proposal, what this loophole does is allow nonresident must-be-guided hunters 100% opportunity to participate in a draw hunt. There are many examples of this out there, of nonresident hunters posting on social media or online hunting forums of, for example, going on a coveted Kodiak brown bear hunt 5 times. A resident can apply for a



Kodiak brown bear tag for decades and never draw a permit, but nonresidents with enough money to hire a guide have a 100% opportunity to hunt. There are raffles conducted by other sportsman's organizations offering a guided Kodiak brown bear hunt to the winner, showing conclusively what is going on, that nonresidents don't really have to go through any draw permit process at all to be guaranteed an opportunity to hunt.

It is not constitutional to require resident hunters to go through a draw permit "lottery" process in order to hunt on certain federal lands in Alaska, yet allow nonresident guided hunters to skip that same draw permit lottery process, skip paying an application fee, and skip having their name in the public record.

Proposal 239 – 5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.

Require all resident registration permit hunts be available for application online

SUPPORT

This is a RHAK proposal that seeks to discontinue the ongoing deterrent used by the Department of requiring hunters to pick up certain registration permits ahead of the hunting season in outlying areas that are expensive to get to.

The Department is on record explaining why there is a requirement to pick up certain registration hunts in outlying villages: this deters non-local hunters from acquiring a permit and competing with locals for a limited resource.

If a wildlife resource is limited, and the Department has concerns of overharvest or going over quotas, it would seem a better approach would be for those hunts to be under a Tier hunt system whereby locals have a priority to hunt. All resident hunters are equal under the law in terms of registration hunts; all residents should have equal opportunity to acquire a registration permit online.

Proposal 241 – 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep and mountain goat drawing permit hunts. 5 AAC 92.061. Special provisions for brown bear drawing permit hunts. 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose and caribou drawing permit hunts.

Remove allocations between guided and nonguided nonresident hunters.

SUPPORT

This is a RHAK proposal addressing past and current proposals, and Board of Game actions that separate out nonresident must-be-guided hunters and nonresidents hunting with an Alaskan relative within second-degree-of-kindred (2DK).

Alaska's "must-be-guided" law (AS 16.05.407) requires all nonresident U.S. citizens to either have a licensed guide, or a resident 2DK relative acting as their guide, to hunt brown bear, Dall sheep, and mountain goat. Nowhere does the statute make any differentiation between those nonresidents hunting with a guide or resident relative, yet the Board of Game has separated out those groups in some cases to give a preference to the guided nonresident hunter, and there are continuing efforts to discriminate against the nonresident hunter who hunts with a resident relative as their guide.



The board has also put the nonresident 2DK hunters in the resident pool of tags for the Kodiak Island brown bear draw hunt. All nonresidents are equal under AS 16.05.407 and the board should not interpret the statute differently.

Miscellaneous Topics and Game Management Unit Boundaries

Proposal 168- 5 AAC 92.XXX. New regulation.

Adopt a new regulation that specifies the Board of Game will not require guides for nonresidents hunting moose, caribou, or black bear.

SUPPORT

This is a RHAK proposal having to do with creation of new must-be-guided species hunts for nonresident U.S. citizens by the board, that falls outside what we believe is the board's authority. Alaska's must-be-guided law, AS 16.05.407, requires nonresident U.S. citizens to hire a licensed guide or hunt with a resident relative within second-degree-of-kindred when hunting brown bear, Dall sheep, and mountain goat.

If the legislature wanted to require nonresident U.S. citizens to hire a guide or hunt with a resident relative for other species, those species would be within the statute.

Agenda Change Requests for Consideration at Statewide Meeting

Proposal 267 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.

Limit or restrict all nonresident sheep hunting in Unit 19C

SUPPORT

This is a RHAK Agenda Change Request (ACR 4) that was accepted to be considered at the Statewide meeting as proposal 267, asking for limits or restrictions on nonresident sheep hunters in Game Management Unit 19C.

The 19C sheep population is in significant decline and the Department stated in comments on ACR 4 that it *"believes existing regulations are contributing to a decline in sheep populations in Unit 19C."*

The 2020/2021 subsistence winter hunt (RS 380) was closed by emergency order and the 2021/2022 subsistence hunt has a restricted bag limit *"due to biological concerns."*

To protect the sheep population and resident hunting opportunities, the unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunities that now account for 85 percent of the total sheep harvest in Unit 19C needs to be restricted or limited.

Thank you to Board of Game members for your service, and as always thank you to Board Support and Agency staff!

Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)
www.residenthuntersofalaska.org



Submitted By
Francie Roberts
Submitted On
2/16/2022 2:15:00 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9072351068

Email
francie.roberts@gmail.com

Address
495 Mountain View Dr
Homer, Alaska 99603

I support the passage of Proposal 199. Traps should not be close to areas where adults and children and pets are recreating. There is enough space for traps to be set back from these areas. I also encourage this proposal to be expanded to the Kenai Peninsula.

Submitted By
Alissa Nadine Rogers
Submitted On
3/5/2021 11:13:21 PM
Affiliation



PC155
1 of 2

There is no scientific proof of how this process would improve or disprove the actual hunting regulations. If you want to move the weight difference with the actual distance of hunting. Then there has to be data showing significant impacts and proof.

Please provide proof of the distance of each weight and distance of ideal hunting (distance). Then the difference in the average between the two- also please bring proof of how this distance would provide an average of what you are looking for. From personal experience... it depends on where you hunt. Animals more comfortable to people (taking pictures/ sight seers).. If you within so many miles out here in the real Alaska. Good luck getting that close and walking/ running as fast as they do on tundra. I've only know a few people in my family, who they call tundra walkers/runners. Good Luck running as fast as they do... out here in our western region. Historically, spears were main source of distance hunting, bow hunting was the same- but you had to be good at it at far distances (not as accurate as spear hunting at the same distance, even if you're trying to shoot from the same difference. Spear Throwing was always more sufficient.)

Anyway, we can always test this out. I'm always up for the great new updates on hunting. Maybe we can help your youth learn to adjust to regional hunting or learn new methods. The sky is the opportunity to learning, we have so many great resources to teaching young hunters. Instead of changing regulations, how about advancing and reaching out to hunters.

We all have our own version of youth hunting traits... Just because a version doesn't work, doesn't mean you have reached out to the locals who have hunted the lands far beyond and still remember the techniques of hunting with a bow.

I, recommend reaching out to the traditional hunters of the area and finding out, the true bow hunting area. Find out why they have their traditions and why they want to have those regulations. For every regulation, there is history. Some good history and some bad. But, nothing that should be offending, as it all happened in the past and not directly to you.

Please contact me if you would like more assistance.

Thank you,

Alissa

On another note: Please do not use data on southern animals, as Alaskan animals and those that live more north- have thicker skin and are more adapted to having more fat- plus more "umph"- given their current hunting acknowledgments.

Also, if you try to bring this up here in our hunting area... you would be better off shooting something smaller with that type of power...

Submitted By
Alissa Nadine Rogers
Submitted On
3/5/2021 11:34:55 PM
Affiliation

~~The vast majority of air rifles available today come in either the .177 or .22 caliber, but several manufacturers have developed what are called "big bore" airguns in the .257, .30, .357, .45 & .50 caliber range. With their larger ammo and focused power, big bore airguns bring power and accuracy to hunting larger **PESTS** making them a popular choice for a lot of shooters.

Hyperlink: <https://www.airgundepot.com/big-bore-airguns.html>



Submitted By
Alissa Nadine Rogers
Submitted On
3/5/2021 10:30:50 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9073064345

Email
alissa.n.rogers@alaska.gov

Address
PO Box 2405 Bethel AK 99559
Bethel, Alaska 99559

~PROPOSAL 121

5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions.

Allow the use of dogs to hunt big game as follows:

The use of dogs is permitted to hunt, track, and retrieve large game.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? It's currently illegal to use hunting dogs for large game such as deer, bear, etc... It is a method used for thousands of years and completely ethical. It promotes safety, 100% ethical, and still fair chase.

Appologize for the grammar/spelling errors:

Thank you for your great idea and thank you for your proposal.

Great Ideas as they do this down states for the majority of it, but NO- Not for Alaska. There are so many things that can go wrong with this proposal and there is so many issues that can arise from this during rural hunting.

I can see people shooting other peoples dogs or accidentally hunting other people. All rural/ bush hunters already know to leave their dogs in the boat or in the cabin when hunting. At most, if you can't leave the dogs at home- they stay at home with a sitter. Dogs scare game away large game with their urine and feces.

Dog's are not used as hunting mechanisms in our area. They are used as working dogs. Yes, they can be trained to do so, but if you have everyone trying to do this.... It will become a disasterous realtionship between hunters and also this will reduce death in pets, if people decide to take them out to hunt moose where non-dog-users (will be shot without quesion).

Here is the truth, if I was out in my traditional hunting grounds. A ramdom dog shows up harassing my Bull Moose that I was working 4-5 days pulling out to the meadow. I'd have no problem shooting that damn dog- as we have no season for hunting farrell dogs.

By; Alissa Nadine Rogers

Phone: 907-306-4345



Submitted By

Jillian Rogers Submitted On

2/16/2022 12:37:13 PM

Affiliation

Homer Animal Shelter

Phone

9073784246

Email

homeranimalservices@gmail.com Address

PO BOX 15291

Fritz Creek, Alaska 99603

I'm writing in support of Proposal 144 and for Trap-Neuter Vaccinate- Return. I implore the Board of Game to support this important proposal and to exempt sterilized community cats from being listed as prohibited from being released into the wild. This program is recognized and used in almost all other states as it has proven time and time again to reduce the number of community cats in the long term. Euthanizing community or stray cats only adds the problem. More cats come into the colony to replace the ones gone. TNR, over the long term, reduces the numbers. As the director of the municipal shelter in Homer, this does not come up often, but it does come up. Being able to release these cats back to where they can live successfully and not reproduce, is the humane thing to do. It just makes sense. And it's about time that Alaska got on board.

From the desk of

Sam Rohrer
P.O. Box 1388
Kodiak, AK 99615



PC157
1 of 2

February 18, 2022

Kristy Tibbles
Executive Director, AK BOG
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

RE. 2022 BOG Statewide Meeting Comments

Chairman Burnett and BOG Members,

Thank you for serving our state and its wildlife resources and thank you for taking the time to read my comments on Statewide proposals.

Proposals 151 and 241 are specifically aimed at making changes to Unit 8 (Kodiak) regulations. These proposals are not appropriate for a statewide meeting, rather they should be submitted when Unit 8 is in cycle. I encourage the board to defeat these proposals for that reason. Additionally, the Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee is unanimously opposed to these 2 proposals. Please take a close look at the AC comments.

Kodiak's Brown Bear Management Strategy is regarded as one of the most successful systems in wildlife conservation. This system is the result of careful work that the Kodiak community and ADF&G, in conjunction with the Board of Game has put together over the last 40 years. There are many important components to this system, and much time and thought has been given to how the whole system works together to benefit bears, hunters, the state of Alaska, and the Kodiak community.

If the BOG passes proposals 151 and 241 there will be seriously negative conservation, economic, and resident hunter opportunity consequences. I ask that the BOG be very careful in how it changes this enormously successful program.

Proposal – 151 OPPOSE

I ask that you oppose proposal 151. This proposal would prohibit the Department from making undersubscribed permits available over the counter. Reissuing of undersubscribed permits is not a “loophole” as the proponent of this proposal suggests, but rather, it is a process that is clearly authorized under both 5AAC 92.052.(23) and 5AAC 92.061.(4)(D).

There are many legitimate reasons why the department might choose to reissue undersubscribed permits. In the case of Unit 8, it serves to offer important consumer protections and helps to safeguard economic opportunities for small businesses.

Reissuing of undersubscribed permits allows nonresident hunters who for some reason must cancel their Kodiak Bear hunt an opportunity to cancel their hunt and it allows the hunting guide an opportunity to then rebook the hunt with a new client. If a client cancels their hunt, and the hunting guide is not able to rebook the hunt, then the client loses their deposit. This hurts both the client who lost their deposit, the guide who was not able to receive full payment for the hunt, but also other small businesses who benefit from nonresident hunters, such as local taxidermist, meat processors, bush plane operators, and hotels. It also causes ADF&G to lose out on valuable tag fees. However, because the department can reissue a permit, a hunting guide is able to rebook a new client and return the canceled hunters deposit. This is good for nonresident hunters, small businesses, and ADF&G.

Proposal 151 does nothing to benefit resident hunters, however it does hurt nonresident hunters, small businesses, and conservation funding. I ask that you unanimously reject this proposal.



Proposal – 241 Oppose

I ask that you oppose proposal 241. This proposal would remove any allocation differences between nonresidents and second degree of kindred (2DK) nonresident hunters. This proposal serves no conservation benefit and would harm resident hunters and small guide businesses.

Passage of this proposal would bring substantial harm to Unit 8 hunters and the Kodiak economy. It would also very likely result in the reduction of bear permits for both resident and nonresident hunters on Kodiak. Currently 2dk hunters harvest sows and small boars at a substantially higher rate than guided nonresident hunters. However, because the number of permits that are allocated to 2DK is small, this does not have a significant biological impact. However, if the limit on 2DK hunters was removed, Kodiak would see a large increase in 2DK participation, this would result in a substantial increase in sow harvest, and a subsequent reduction in available permits to all hunters.

Further, resident hunters can apply for Kodiak Bear permits using a party application with their 2DK relative. This is an important benefit for resident hunters. If proposal 241 passed, this opportunity for resident hunters would no longer be available.

The BOG has a long-standing policy for evaluating allocative proposals, that includes considering the last 10 years of harvest history. This proposal asks for an allocation that is not comparable to the harvest history and that would cause substantial biological harm and economic harm. For these reasons, I ask that you unanimously reject this proposal.

Proposal – 152/239 Oppose

I ask that you oppose proposal 152/239. This proposal seeks to tie the hands of the department and the BOG in the issuing of drawing permits. While generally all drawing permit hunts are available for online application, there is limited times when the department or the BOG chooses to offer there permits in a different manner.

In a state as large as Alaska, it is rare that one-size-fits-all solutions work. There are legitimate reasons why the Department and the BOG might choose to not offer drawing permits for application online. For this reason, I ask that you unanimously reject this proposal.

Proposal – 163/164 Support

I ask that you support proposals 163 and 164. These 2 proposals would require a hunter to validate their harvest ticket or permit upon wounding an animal.

Fair Chase ethics require that a hunter already abides by what this proposal would require. A version of this proposal has already been in regulation for Bear and Elk hunters in Unit 8 for many years. Some would argue that this proposal is unenforceable, but that misses the point of the proposal. It does not matter if the proposal is enforceable or not, what matters is that the State of Alaska and the BOG is clearly showing how an ethical hunter should conduct themselves. For this reason, I ask that you unanimously support these 2 proposals.

Thank you for taking the time to thoughtfully read my comments. I appreciate all that you do for Alaska!

Respectfully,

Sam Rohrer
Kodiak, AK



Submitted By
Justin Rondeau
Submitted On
2/17/2022 12:27:47 PM
Affiliation

Phone
3609123520

Email
Justin@cobaltbioscience.com

Address
256761 HWY 101
Port Angeles , Washington 98362

I am writing in support of Proposal 113 which allows non resident take of Eyas and Passage Gyrs, Peregrines, and Goshawks. My wife Bethany was lucky enough to draw a non resident gyrfalcon permit 3 years ago and we had a magical time in Nome seeking and eventually finding a beautiful passage Gyrfalcon. We also spent thousands of dollars on housing and vehicle rentals, food and fuel for the trip and even came home with some nickknacks from shopping in downtown Nome.

I can't for the life of me figure out why anyone would want to limit non resident take when such a minuscule number of birds is affected. Please help us maintain this integral part of our falconry culture.

Submitted By
Amy Russell
Submitted On
2/16/2022 12:53:50 PM
Affiliation



PC159
1 of 1

I support proposal 199. It has gotten to the point where I am scared to take my dog out anymore. The degree of laziness I have seen lately from trappers is shocking. A minimum of 50 yard setback from established trails seems actually too generous.

Thank you for your time,

Amy Russell

Submitted By
Revelle Russell
Submitted On
2/16/2022 1:00:36 PM
Affiliation



PC160
1 of 1

I support proposal 199 setting back traps at least 50 yards from trails. As it stands, trappers' rights are overriding my right to ski on a trail with my dog. Trappers are setting traps in residential areas, it is outrageous. I fail to see the detriment to trappers having to set their line up in a place that reduces risk to their neighbors.

Thank you,

Revelle Russell

Submitted By
Michelle Scaman
Submitted On
2/14/2022 11:44:13 AM
Affiliation



PC161
1 of 1

I support Proposal 144, trap-neuter-vaccinate-return (TNVR). It is important to our community.



My name is Kurt Schmidt, I am from Delta Junction Alaska, and have been a licensed falconer for over 30 years and a fulltime Alaskan resident for over 20 years.

I am currently a public school educator, and formerly was a biologist conducting raptor surveys for the Bureau of Land Management, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, National Park Service.

I fully Support Proposal 108 because it increases the opportunity for nonresident take in a sound manner and it exceeds recent nonresident interest of 13 applicants (High of 26 applicants and low of 13, average of 21 applicants per year.)

It offers 5 passage birds, 5 eyass peregrines, 5 eyass goshawks, tripling the current allowable take.

Eyass gyrfalcons should not be offered because of their multi generational use sensitive nest sites which are have been used repeatedly for millennia. Non-residents have recently been observed sharing nest site locations, advertising nest site locations all over the internet and increasing the risk and causing focused repeated take/disturbance to these sensitive nest sites. The collective non-resident lack of stewardship and concern for the long term welfare of these sensitive sites for both legal and illegal activities is a growing concern.

I fully support Proposal 109 and which requires the micro-chipping of gyr falcons being exported from the state on a non resident permit. The microchip is harmless as was observed by nonresidents bringing their birds to Alaska for falconry and self-electing to micro tag to avoid any mix-ups or confusion as to lawful ownership. The microchip offers a more permanent means of tagging a passage bird and will act as a deterrent to reduce the risk of these high value exported birds falling into unlawful commerce situations.

I fully support Proposal 110 pushing back the passage season take dates to September 15-November 15th to preclude the repeated interest of non-residents targeting certain nests and sharing nest site information both privately and internationally on social media that has caused undue attention and disturbance to certain nest sites. By pushing



back the take dates and allowing the chicks to fledge and disperse from their natal areas, will eliminate this undue nest site disturbance and reduce the widespread harmful sharing of sensitive nest site information.

I fully support Proposal 111 which limits a nonresident to being able to draw a once every four years to allow other folks to be able to participate in the resource. One person has drawn a permit three times and this unfortunate scenario limits the access of other applicants.

I do not support Proposal 112 which would put unreasonable levels of harvest on the reasonably accessible nest sites to Alaskan falconers and it would create a situation of undue hardship for Alaskans interested in taking a bird due to an exponential increase in take. This proposal shows the disregard nonresidents are willing to inflict upon the people that live here and the resource.

I AM VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO PROPOSAL 112.

I do not support Proposal 113. The proposal is unreasonable in number and will create an undue hardship on resident falconers by creating disturbance at the few easy access nest sites available. To show how lopsided their perspective is, one of the sources they cite here to support their perspective, will actually be testifying against their proposal.

Thank You,
Kurt Schmidt



Submitted By
Timothy Sell
Submitted On
1/30/2021 12:41:03 PM
Affiliation
Alaska falconers association

Phone
9072428654
Email
tim@alaskagyrfalcons.com
Address
14441 Rocky rd
anchorage, Alaska 99516

108. I support this proposal. It allows falconers from the lower 48 access to the large coastal Peales peregrine falcons and the large Alaskan goshawks as eyasses. These are very sought after by non resident falconers and it doesn't have any negative effect on Alaskan falconers.

109. I support this proposal but would take it even further to eliminate the chip requirement completely. It is redundant as these birds are already banded with an unremovable leg band that is quite capable of tracking their movements.

110. I support this proposal. When the non resident season was established it was intended to be a passage only take as it is worded. Young birds on their natal nesting sites are not passage birds, a passage bird is described as a bird free of its parents home territory and feeding itself. Several non resident falconers have gone on the opening date and harvested birds from their natal nesting areas, still being fed by parent falcons, these are clearly not passage birds and the date change assures that these practices cease.

111. I support this change

112. I do not support this proposal. With the approval of proposal #108 and the current passage take available to non resident falconers, non residents have access to gyrfalcons, Peales peregrines and northern goshawks. These are far and away the three species of interest to falconers from the lower 48 and nothing more is required and might impact the availability of raptors to residents.

113. I do not support this proposal. With the approval of proposal #108 and the current passage take available to non resident falconers, non residents have access to gyrfalcons, Peales peregrines and northern goshawks. These are far and away the three species of interest to falconers from the lower 48 and nothing more is required and might impact the availability of raptors to residents.

Submitted By
Bill Sherwonit
Submitted On
2/18/2022 4:06:45 PM
Affiliation
self



PC164
1 of 1

Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I'm writing to express my whole-hearted support for Proposal 199, which would establish 50-yard trapping setbacks (or buffers) along certain trails in the Mat-Su Valley region. The setbacks would only affect popular recreational trails, often used by people accompanied by dogs. Though I live in Anchorage, I occasionally have hiked and skied in the Mat-Su area with my dog and thus have a vested interest in this proposed change. But whether or not I happen to recreate on the affected trails, I support this proposal as a common-sense and much-needed (and overdue) action, given the dangers to dogs and the consequent impacts on their human companions.

It's my understanding that at least seven dogs have been caught in traps this winter in Southcentral Alaska, and two have been killed by traps. This is unacceptable. There is widespread agreement among Southcentral residents, including many trappers from what I've been informed, that traps should be set away from popular multi-purpose recreational trails. We've all heard the horror stories of people whose dogs were trapped—and sometimes killed—when walking their canine companions in popular recreational areas that didn't have a substantial buffer (or any buffer at all).

Though the BOG sometimes shies away from public-safety issues, there is precedence for such trapping buffers, one notable example being Chugach State Park, where trapping setbacks are required where trapping is allowed. In the Mat-Su area, as in Chugach Park, enacting a 50-yard setback is really about the greater public good, with a minimum of hardship—if any—to those who do recreational trapping.

Whatever arguments opponents of this ordinance might put forward, I don't think anyone can seriously criticize the intention of this proposed ordinance; in the end, this is a public safety issue, with the safety of dogs at its heart. Of the many people I know who have dogs, most, if not all, consider their dogs to be companions and family members. I can vouch from my own life, that the death of a dog, whatever the circumstances, can be heartbreaking. For many of us it is, in fact, the loss of a family member. To have one caught in a trap would be an awful tragedy. This common-sense change will lessen the likelihood of that happening for people and dogs who walk or ski or bike along popular multi-purpose recreational trails in the Mat-Su region. How can that not be a good thing?

Thank you for considering my perspective,

Bill Sherwonit, Anchorage



Comments on Proposal 144 – Do not adopt

Ms. Basner's proposal makes a host of seriously inaccurate and misleading claims but one of the worst is her primary argument that because cats are capable of surviving in the wild in Alaska and because feral or stray cats can be captured in the wild for use as a pet, then cats should be removed from the list of domestic species that may not be released into the wild. Those two reasons (among others) are exactly why cats are on the list. Cats are not wildlife, cats are an invasive species that is highly destructive to wildlife due to predation, which affects species as large as snowshoe hares, and cat-related diseases, which infects lynx, moose, and even birds as large as eagles.

Cats kill an estimated 1.3 – 4 billion wild birds and 6.3 – 22.3 billion wild mammals in the U.S. annually. <http://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms2380> These small animals are the base of the food chain for many wild furbearers, raptors and owls.

I am a wildlife biologist with over 45 years of experience. I have reviewed and rebutted several of the most highly touted studies by TNR proponents and have written a detailed report on feral cats in Alaska with a special emphasis on Anchorage.

<https://www.trapneuterenclose.com/static/img/tnr-study-review.pdf>

https://abcbirds.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Sinnott-2019_Citizen-science-or-pseudoscience_Response-to-Spehar-and-Wolf-2018.pdf

<https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/SiteAssets/Pages/WNRCReso-MinutesArchive/WNRC%20tr%20to%20Animal%20Control%20Board%20w%20Report-12-20-2019%20rev.pdf>

If you want to reduce or eliminate rats, do you provide feeding stations for them so you can attempt to catch the least trap wary individuals, neuter them and release them back into the wild? Of course not. By providing food, you will increase their productivity and survival, thereby increasing the population. Adopting a “no-kill” philosophy will never reduce the population. It will continue to increase because the rats who have not yet been trapped will continue to have fertile offspring and when the population increases you will want to put out more feeding stations. Cats are not rats, but they are both invasive, exotic species and the principles of population dynamics apply to both.

Contrary to what Ms. Basner writes, when communities implement TNR, cat numbers only decline initially, when people are excited about the new program and are willing to adopt cats. When most or all of the willing cat homes are full, adoptions fall off and cat numbers plateau or rise. People release adopted cats into the wild all of the time. There is not a single scientific study that has shown a significant decline in “community” cats over a time span of a decade or more. Most of the “studies” are anecdotal or they use population indices like “number of intakes” or “number euthanized” at shelters. The number of intakes and euthanized cats doesn't decline because there are fewer cats, it declines because more people are adopting cats in the short term.

Cats – even sterilized cats – should never be released into the wild. The number of feral and stray cats must be reduced. I have submitted several proposals (106, 107, 166, 167) for the Board to consider that will help address this scourge to our wildlife populations.

Rick Sinnott
Certified Wildlife Biologist



Submitted By

David Skinner

Submitted On

2/17/2022 1:42:25 PM

Affiliation

South Central Director Idaho Falconers Association

Phone

208-720-8899

Email

david_skinner@usa.net

Address

502 E 200 S

Fairfield , Idaho 83327

Thank you for allowing me to comment. I support proposal 113 in regards to out of state wild take of raptors for falconry. Take of wild raptors at these levels will never affect populations.

Submitted By
Susan Skvorc
Submitted On
2/16/2022 11:19:36 AM
Affiliation
VMBaH member



PC167
1 of 1

I am writing in support of Proposal 199 dealing with a 50 yd setback for the placement of traps near popular multi use trails in the Mat-Su Borough. I have lived in the borough for 32 years and have seen the great increase in population and number of people accessing trails in the area. The increased use has made it necessary to increase the buffer between trails where people and pets travel and areas of legal trapping. When I ski or bike with my dog he is always on a leash, but he is a dog and if he got loose he would run after rabbits and the like, and possibly be in danger of being caught in a trap that is near or on the trail. In deep snow, even human walkers could be at risk of accidently getting a foot caught in a trap obscured by snow. Thank you for considering this proposal.



Submitted By
Terry Slaven
Submitted On
2/18/2022 2:22:03 PM
Affiliation
myself

Phone
19073736363
Email
terryms@gci.net
Address
1800 E PINTAIL DR
WASILLA, Alaska 99654

I support Proposal 199 which would provide a 50 yard trap set back on many MatSu trails. I am a frequent user of these trails and frequently bring my dog along. I use a leash on my dog but sometimes he gets away from me - never very far but I fear he could easily smell a nearby trap set up and get caught in it. I believe trappers need to get off the trails we all use and set their traps away from where dogs, children and hikers could accidentally get caught in one. This is a big borough and trails are narrow corridors winding through wild lands. I believe trappers have plenty of space in which to trap while leaving a 50 yard set back for the rest of us.

Submitted By
Lisa Slepetski
Submitted On
1/18/2022 4:18:24 PM
Affiliation



PC169
1 of 1

I **SUPPORT** the following proposals:

- **Proposal 107 - Add unconfined and unrestrained domestic cats to the definition of “deleterious exotic wildlife”;**
- **Proposal 145 - Classify *F. catus* as deleterious exotic wildlife and prohibit their release into the wild, feeding, and maintaining unconfined populations;**
- **Proposal 160 - Clarify the wanton waste regulation to specify that game animals taken by domestic pets must be reported and salvaged for human consumption; AND**
- **Proposal 166 - Amend the requirement for licenses and tags to include game legally taken with dogs and cats**

and as such, I **OPPOSE** the following proposal:

- **Proposal 144 - Exempt “sterilized community cats” from the list of species prohibited from being released into the wild.**

Feral and loose domestic cats cause a myriad of problems. The authors of Proposals 107, 145, 160 and 166 clearly illustrate the far reaching harm done when cats are left to roam outdoors uncontrolled, providing references to the scientific studies to back up the suggested actions by the Board of Game. Since cats can spread disease and/or kill Alaskan game, this is a relevant issue that should be addressed and I agree with the reasons and actions presented in the proposals. My husband and myself are extremely allergic to cats so we don't own any on purpose, so it is frustrating and harmful when loose neighborhood cats enter our sheds and spread dander, urine, and feces over our personal property that we subsequently touch and have an allergic reaction to. One cat did not want to leave my shed and threatened to scratch and bite. In the spring through fall, it isn't moose or native wildlife that destroy our gardens - it is neighborhood cats, digging up the vegetable starts that we carefully nurtured for weeks indoors before transplanting, not only destroying our plants and making a waste of our time and energy, but also depositing feces in the soil we are trying to grow edible plants in. We have watched them kill young hares on our property, as well as stalk my bird feeder in the winter and kill native birds. Cat owners that let their cats roam freely have no idea what their cat is doing; even worse, feral cats have no owner and as such, who would be accountable for their negative impact on others?

As stated in the proposals I support, allowing cats to roam free - feral or not - is not humane. From raptors to coyotes to lynx, to getting run over, getting pregnant, fighting with other cats, or getting diseased, the cruel ways in which loose cats can be hurt or killed is extensive. Cats are a large part of a coyote's diet in urban areas. It is a waste of money to trap neuter and release as feral cats draw in newcomer cats (feral or domestic) to their colony, meaning that 100 percent TNR is impossible - all while failing to provide true safety for the cats, while perpetuating problems for wildlife as well as humans.

Thank you for your time.



Submitted By
James R. Smith II
Submitted On
2/10/2022 6:50:01 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907-388-6842
Email
huntersmith54071@msn.com
Address
1820 Wildberry Loop
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

OPPOSE Prop 137- I oppose prop 137. As a Resident of Alaska since 2004, since this prop went into place I have seen major differences while in the field. While in the field with boots on the ground the experience of a backpack sheep hunter as become much better. Theres been alot less airplane traffic buzzing around and people looking for sheep. Individuals say this isnt enforceable. I disagree. Since prop 207 went into place why has the amount of airplane traffic declined? This keeps the honest man honest. Ive always said if you know for sure youre coming into land and you have to do a couple touch and goes and circle back and someone thinks your flying for sheep than who cares do whats safe for you as a pilot. I get into alot of super cubs and bush planes during sheep season and I have not once heard a pilot say im being rushed or this is a dangerous situtation bc they think that a individual is going to turn them in for flying for sheep.

If forwhatever reason your sheep are bumped bc of predators, hunters or animal behavior from when the pilots original scouting prior to Aug 10 or if you cant land into a spot bc of weather or other hunters, than find a place to land and go hunting. I'm a firm believer in fair chase hunting. Throw your boots and backpack on and hike until you find rams.

The most important thing ive noticed since prop 207 went into place, sheep are alot less nervous when a plane does fly above. Ive noticed this in the Alaska Range, White Mtns and the Brooks Range. Prior to 207 many sheep would run as soon as they would hear or see a low flying plane whether they had been buzzed or not. To me this is the most important reason not pass prop 137.

Individuals need to hunt sheep like how sheep should be hunted. Boots on the ground and fair chase hunting. PERIOD!

SUPPORT prop 138. This makes total sense.

I OPPOSE Prop 151. This is an obvious attack on guides. On the Kodiak there is a system in place that has been created thats been working great. Guides do have to put in for the draw for their clients. There are times that clients can not make their hunt so they have to forfeit their tag. This leaves a hunt spot open based on their allocation numbers with the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. The guide then wants to rebook that spot, he/she has to reach out to the dept. of fish and game and they have authorization to re issue that tag to a new client. This does not help resident hunters what so ever. Plus if this is put in place a non resident who has paid in full not be able to get his/her money back or the outfitter is out the money because they can not rebook the tag.

I support prop 211.



Submitted By
Mindy Irene Smith
Submitted On
2/9/2022 11:39:18 AM
Affiliation

Phone
2082830163
Email
mmisypoo@gmail.com

Address
5501 coyote springs n
Amarillo, Texas 79119

I am in favor of the draw but would like to see the Board take action for this years drawing July 7,2022. That way it is fair and equal as stated in the proposal 265.

Submitted By
Bethany Smithers
Submitted On
2/17/2022 7:05:21 AM
Affiliation



PC172
1 of 1

I am in support of Proposal 199 to mandate setbacks on traps on or near multi-use spaces and trails. There is no reason whatsoever why lethal traps should be placed where domestic pets or children can easily be maimed or killed. These incidents are entirely preventable, and I believe it is incumbent upon us to protect and support safe outdoor family-friendly recreation. As multi-use recreation areas become more popular, the benefits of setbacks to the greater good far outweigh the minor inconvenience to trappers of walking a few extra steps. By definition, "multi-use" means that the rights and protections of all users must be taken into account. When pets are dying, and parents can't take their children on certain trails out of fear, those protections are egregiously violated. I strongly advocate for setbacks on multi-use trails to help keep them safe and enjoyable for all users.

Submitted By
Susan Sommer
Submitted On
2/17/2022 6:14:13 AM
Affiliation



PC173
1 of 1

I support the Alaska Wildlife Alliance's Proposal 199 requesting 50-yard trap setbacks from over 200 multi-use trails in the Mat-Su area, including trails in: Nancy Lakes, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Nelchina, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik Glacier, Willow, and more.

Ideally, I'd like to see trapping banned altogether in such populated areas. Alaska has plenty of room away from high-density population centers for people to trap. There's no good reason for trapping where people and pets roam on a regular basis.



Submitted By
Ted Spraker
Submitted On
2/17/2022 9:45:19 AM
Affiliation

Phone
19073988895
Email
tedspraker@gmail.com
Address
49230 Victoria Ave
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Dear Chairman Burnett and Board Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments addressing proposals before the Board during the statewide meeting. I realize Board members have an extremely busy schedule prior to meetings, but I hope you carefully consider the three proposals I authored (129, 154 and 155), and support them.

Proposal 129- require expanding bullets for big game, except wolf and wolverine.

Justification for this request originates from public testimony concerning wounding loss, primarily moose and caribou, when full metal jacket bullets (solids) were used. The comments generally focused on hunters using 223 or 5.56 caliber rounds with 55 grain full metal jacket bullets. The use of an expanding bullet is the standard in most states for hunting big game, where deer and elk are the primary species hunted, not moose or brown/grizzly bear. This request is comparable to the requirement to use steel shot for hunting waterfowl rather than lead, to reduce loss of birds.

Proposals 135-139- rescind the restriction on spotting sheep using aircraft.

I am opposed to these proposals along with the 86 percent of Alaskan sheep hunters who do not own a super cub. I am especially concerned, during a time of major declines in sheep counts to allow hunters with aircraft to be more efficient at finding and killing rams. I hunted sheep before and after this regulation was adopted, the difference in being harassed by aircraft and a quiet hunt, is like night and day. 207 works. This regulation has been in place now long enough to prove it does make your sheep hunt far more enjoyable, and fair to hunters that cannot fly every evening to spot rams. The current regulation has not prevented anyone from hunting sheep, the harvest data proves this, as many claimed it would.

Proposal 154- issue an additional permit when a party application is drawn for the last permit.

According to comments from the department, drawing a party application for the last permit available does not happen often, but it does. As difficult as permits are to win, I request the protocol be revised to add an additional permit rather than awarding the tag to the next single applicant. The Board may want to limit this to draw hunts with more than 10 permits.

Proposal 155- establish a limited entry draw hunt for "any bull" in all selective harvest moose hunt areas in the state.

The selective harvest strategy was first implemented in Unit 9 (3 brow tine rule) and the upper Susitna in 13B (spike only) in the early 1980s, then increased in area and application with the spike/fork or 50 inches or 3 brow tine rules, in Units 7 and 15, in 1987. Now, there are about 20 Units or portions of Units managed using this selective harvest strategy. Although this management process has been successful in increasing bull to cow ratio and allowing for longer hunting seasons, it is not always easy for inexperienced hunters to determine if a bull moose is legal. Issuing a few permits in each area, will give hunters an opportunity to apply in their local area and potentially increase the odds to draw a tag because more hunt areas are available. Additionally, this will increase money generated by draw hunts during a time when department funds are declining. The three areas where any bull permits for moose were issued generated \$103,665 for fall 2021.

Proposal 199- restrict trapping alone trails.

I am opposed to this request for several reasons.

First, this would be very difficult for enforcement and the trapping community to know where legal trapping could take place, I doubt that all these proposed trails can be identified on a map. Second, this request will not guarantee that free ranging dogs will not be caught in a trap. Alaska Trapper's Association has worked with other trail users and continues to do so to demonstrate a willingness to share trails and to caution trappers about setting certain traps close to trails. Pet owners need to be responsible for keeping their pets under control,

when using trails during the winter trapping season.



Proposal 241- remove the must be guided for non-residents in certain permit hunts.

I am opposed to this request.

There are only a few hunts where this requirement is applied, and it's well justified. The Board worked with the department to identify hunts where this approach was warranted. An allocation of a portion of the permits to guides is a benefit to local Alaskan guides but it doesn't come at a high cost to resident hunters simply because they may draw the permit, but after realizing the cost to make the hunt, they cancel, and the permit is wasted. This proposal has been submitted previously, primarily to destroy a few Alaskan guides.

Proposal 267- Limit or restrict non-resident sheep hunting in 19C.

I am opposed to this request because it will result in less opportunities for residents in other sheep areas and there will not be any benefit to the sheep population.

Unit 19C, is an area that has been heavily hunted by guided non-resident hunters for years but there remains plenty of opportunity for residents to hunt in this area, this is reflected by the harvest data. If guides are limited or restricted, they will simply move to another area, that's already crowded, and reduce hunting opportunities for residents there. Additionally, if this request is granted, resident sheep hunters, realizing guides are limited, will rush to this area like an "Oklahoma Land Rush" and the harvest and crowding will most likely increase.

Since this area is hunted under the full-curl regulation, it would be best to leave the hunt as is. As resident and non-resident hunters realize 19C is no longer a prime hunting area they will seek out new areas, and the over all high number of hunters will decrease. As an example, the Kenai Mountain's sheep population has declined sharply but the season has not changed because of the full-curl regulation.

The organization that submitted this proposal adamantly opposed a guide concession program to reduce guide numbers and keep guides from moving to a new area.

Submitted By
Adam St. Saviour
Submitted On
2/18/2022 11:26:38 PM
Affiliation
Mat Su resident



PC175
1 of 1

My family and I are in support of Proposal 199 and 228. I am a sportsman, and I am very tired of unethical trappers making a bad name for all of us. Every year I come across traps set on or near high use multi-user trails. Every year many pets are harmed or killed, including our own in the recent past. Individuals setting these are not following the trapper's code of ethics, and some are intentionally trying to do harm and cause conflict.

The 50-yard setback, on listed multi-use trails, outlined in Proposal 199, is a very reasonable approach to creating a safe and enjoyable outdoor experience for everyone. The vast majority of users on most of these trails are not trappers and should not have to fear every outing. Meanwhile, those that do want to trap off these trails are not unduly burdened. It is a very short distance to ride or walk and enables an authentic outdoor experience for the trapper. This is a win for all reasonable parties.

We support proposal 228 so that the law could be enforced, and because this will not put an undue burden on trappers that already following the code of ethics.

Submitted By
Mark Stevens
Submitted On
2/18/2022 3:42:40 PM
Affiliation



PC176
1 of 1

I hunted Alaska for the the first time a couple years ago and am already planning a couple more trips in the next few years.

Please don't allow the use of rangefinding sights on archer hunts (123 & 124), or the use of crossbows (101 & 125). I quit going to Arizona each January because of having hunts ruined buy people taking long shots with their crossbow and either missing or wounding game. One guy took a 90 yard shot at a bucking moving towards me, when I was within 40 yards at a buck. The following season, another hunter took a long shot at a buck quartering towards him (not a safe shot). I offered to help him track it, but he gave up after only a couple hours. He also hiked with the cocked crossbow slung on his back (unsafe!). It's too easy for people to pick up a crossbow and hunt as if it's just a slow rifle, in the process taking shots every responsible Bowhunter should know to be unethical.

Also, please don't allow the use of planes to scout during any sheep season--how is that even fair!?! Sheep live in an environment where they are ridiculously easy to spot from far distances--planes shouldn't be allowed.

Without restrictions on technology allowed while hunting, hunter success rate will continue to increase and either populations will start to decline and/or there will have to be reductions in season lengths or tags given(\$\$\$). Please restrict technology to allow more hunters more time in the field.

Thanks,
Mark Stevens

Submitted By
Brian Stoltz
Submitted On
2/17/2022 1:39:04 PM
Affiliation



PC177
1 of 1

I strongly oppose proposals 137 and 139. They roll back the rule of no spotting sheep from the air. I know pilots would not be able to closely circle sheep if hunters are pursuing them either way, however, prior to these rules going into effect I have had a sheep stalk ruined on a full curl ram by a super cub "spotting" the sheep by closely flying back and forth. Being in subdued colors I highly doubt the pilots saw us there. I do not carry a signal device or flares and do not feel like the onus should be in the hunter to ensure there is nobody pursuing sheep while pilots spot animals from the air.

This could be especially problematic if sheep populations decline as pressure will be concentrated on fewer animals.

Thanks for your consideration,
Brian Stoltz

Submitted By
Christine M Tait
Submitted On
2/15/2022 7:16:32 PM
Affiliation
AlpenRose Soap



PC178
1 of 1

I am in favor of Prop 199, Amended.

I recreate with my dogs on many public lands for pleasure and for K9 Search and Rescue training. When we have to worry about our dogs getting caught in a trap, and possibly killed, our choices for not only training, but for searching for lost and missing people, becomes very limited.

Please regulate the areas that are used both by dog owners and trappers. There are more dog owners than trappers, and human populations are only increasing. This conflict will continue to escalate if preventative measures are not taken soon. Please support Prop 199, and help prevent any further unnecessary dog deaths.

Thank you,
Christine

LAW OFFICE OF KNEELAND TAYLOR, P.C.

310 K Street, Suite 305
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-276-6219 office telephone
[REDACTED] cell phone
907-258-7329 FAX
e-mail: [REDACTED]



PC179
1 of 8

February 17, 2022

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

To the Board of Game, and Board Support:

I am in this letter providing my comments to the proposals to be considered at your spring meeting which commences on March 4, 2022. I am providing with my comments one attachment, which is a print-out of material appearing on the website of the Great Land Trust. If there are any technical difficulties, please do not hesitate to contact me. My comments to a few of the proposals are as follows:

Proposal 199 Amended. I support it. This amended proposal would provide for 50 yard buffers for a short list of specific trails in the MatSu Borough. Within the buffers, some trapping would be permitted, but only with limited methods and means.

Having said that I support Proposal 199 Amended, I must make clear that I am deeply disappointed with the process used to prepare the amended proposal, and with the limited result. That process involved a meeting held on February 14 at the ADF&G Field Office in Palmer the purpose of which was to negotiate a compromise between proponents of Proposal 199, and "stakeholders". I thought that meant representatives of organized trapping associations.

To begin, I want to sincerely thank Board Member Lynn Keogh for trying to accomplish something positive.

But the fact is that the process didn't work. Let me point to one specific trail as an example; namely the "Swan Lake Trail". The Swan Lake Trail is a relatively short trail in the Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge, which originates in the recently completed Ranch Subdivision in Wasilla. It and the Swan Lakes Upland



Loop Trail are immediately adjacent to several single-family homes and the trailhead is approximately 200 yards from the Machetan Elementary School. The trail is mostly at ground level but includes some elevated boardwalk sections through wet areas and to an overlook on Swan Lake. **The trail is heavily used by the hundreds of residents in the nearby subdivisions and by school groups who regularly utilize the trail as an outdoor classroom.** In addition, the trail and surrounding area is used in winter by walkers, ice skaters, skiers, and others. It is located on nearly 1000 acres of lands owned by the Great Land Trust within the Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge.

I am providing copies of materials taken from the Great Land Trust's website, which include a map and pictures. Please take a look. Please take a look also at the comment by Barbara Jones. She is taught at the Machetan Elementary School and used the trail on numerous occasions as an outdoor class room.

I agreed to participate in a stakeholder group with Board Member Keogh the purpose of which was to negotiate a compromise. But three trappers not associated with any trapping organization attended, and were granted what amounted to veto power. One of the two unaffiliated trappers who lives in Cooper Landing said he didn't know anything about the Swan Lake trail, and therefore vetoed its inclusion on the compromise list, while the other, a MatSu trapper, said he wanted to trap fox along the trail.

The Alaska Wildlife Alliance submitted a petition with more than a hundred signatures, and the general public submitted more than a hundred comments supporting buffers for this trail, and many others. And yet the Swan Lake Trail was vetoed by two individuals; one who openly said his veto was because he didn't know anything about the trail.

Board Member Keogh tried hard, but he was mistaken to give veto power to unaffiliated trappers, one of whom only wanted to make trouble. We all make mistakes, and I don't blame Mr. Keogh.

I blame the Department. The Department abdicates its responsibilities by asserting that closures to protect the public are "allocation" issues. Trapping with 330 Connibears on trails located next to elementary schools and used as an outdoor classroom is a public safety issue. It is absurd to not provide the Swan Lake trail with a buffer. Proposals should be evaluated on the merits. Career employees of the Department know this is true, and know that setting large traps along trails such as the Swan Lake trail should be banned. It is public safety which is at stake. Not allocation.

Proposal No. 199 Amended, if adopted, will allow some traps within of trails, but will allow unrestricted trapping on the remainder of the Great Land Trust's in-holding. We, the proponents of buffers gave up a lot in reaching compromise on February 14. If compromise is not possible, then people like me will do our best to persuade the Trust to close the entire in-holding to all furbearer trapping. Why compromise if the door is slammed shut in our faces at the request of a single trapper who says he doesn't know anything about the trail?



Here is what I believe should happen going forward:

1. Proposal 199 Amended should be modified to include the Swan Lake Trail, and the amended proposal should be approved at the Spring 2022 meeting, by the BOG.
2. The BOG should request the Department to prepare a comprehensive list of heavily used multi purpose trails, trail heads, roads, public use cabins, and campgrounds in Units 14A, and 14B where there should be buffers. Guidance should be given to the Department as to what the BOG is looking for. The Department has the career employees, resources, and expertise to do a good job in preparing a list, and marshaling the reasons for inclusion of each trail, trailhead, etc.
3. The Department's list should be put forward for consideration by the BOG at a later date, after notice and opportunity for comment by the public, including all interested parties.
4. The BOG at this meeting (March 2022) should close all furbearer trapping within the city limits of Palmer and Wasilla. Reasonable exceptions for law enforcement to deal with nuisance animals should be allowed.

It was repeatedly stated by two of the unaffiliated trappers at the February 14, meeting that they worried that compromise would only encourage what they referred to as "creep". In other words, people like me would ask for, and get, more in the future. I understand that the Alaska Frontier Trappers Association categorically rejects any closures for the same reason: i.e. fear of "creep". They are wrong. The consequence of enacting reasonable restrictions reducing the setting of traps in the wrong places will end the public outcry for a stop.

What follows in this letter are my comments on a few of the other proposals before the Board.



Proposal 134. Oppose. This proposal would authorize the use of motion detecting cameras and sensory devices that can send messages through wireless communications. This proposal is limited to devices set near traps, while another proposal would authorize these devices anywhere. Generally speaking, the use of devices that can spot game and instantly transmit the information to someone far away is bad idea, because these devices make it too easy to hunt, and contribute to the game-farming of Alaska,

But the use of these devices near traps could be beneficial in a well-regulated program aimed at reducing suffering of animals caught in traps. As a society we mete out prison time and large fines for owners of domestic animals who allow their animals to die slowly, by starvation, and exposure. The major religions of the world support the humane treatment of animals. Killing an animal by starvation, and exposure over a long period of time is not humane. Ethical trappers agree, and return to their traps frequently. But not all trappers in Alaska are ethical.

Motion detecting devices, with wireless communication to the trapper could be linked with regulations mandating immediate return to a trap after receiving notice that an animal has been trapped. If the regulatory scheme were to so-provide, and were the scheme to be enforceable with things like the registration and monitoring of these devices, then I would support it. Since it is highly unlikely that the Board will enact a genuine regulatory scheme requiring trappers to quickly to dispatch trapped animal, I oppose the proposal.

Incidentally, the justification provided by the proponent about securing traps from marauding recreational users is not a sufficient basis to adopt the proposal. Disturbing or stealing a trap is a criminal offense already, and there is no evidence of widespread violation of the criminal statutes. When traps are disturbed it is usually when someone's dog gets caught, and the owner releases his pet.

Proposal 121. Oppose. This proposal would allow the use of hunting dogs in hunting, tracking and taking big game. While the proposer asserts the use of dogs in taking big game is fair chase, it is not.

Proposal 129. Oppose. This proposal by former BOG chair Ted Spraker would REQUIRE the use of expanding soft point bullets for big game hunting, excluding wolf and wolverine. While this proposal, if adopted, might reduce the loss of

animals through wounding of game, it would also increase the risk of death to humans through all-to-frequent hunting accidents.



Proposals 135, 136, and 137 Oppose. These identical proposals would authorize the use of aircraft to spot Dall Sheep during the open season. Once spotting is authorized, it would be impossible to enforce prohibitions on herding Dall sheep to more accessible elevations.

Proposal 234. Oppose. This proposal would authorize the use of stationary sensory or motion detecting devices (cameras) that can send messages through wireless communication. As stated above, the authorization of the use of these devices is, generally speaking, a bad idea.

Proposal 235. Oppose. This proposal would authorize the use of artificial light to hunt small game. The use of artificial light in hunting small game will serve as an invitation to people who want to hunt in the dark. Hunting in the dark poses a threat to the safety of ordinary citizens out for a walk, hike, or ski after hours. Hunters need to be respectful of the rights of other Alaskans who want to enjoy the outdoors, after hours.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kneeland Taylor".

Kneeland Taylor

MENU

LEARN

[\(https://greatlandtrust.org/priorities/\)](https://greatlandtrust.org/priorities/)

GET INVOLVED

[\(https://greatlandtrust.org/support/\)](https://greatlandtrust.org/support/)

DONATE

[\(https://secure.donationpay.org/greatlandtrust.org/\)](https://secure.donationpay.org/greatlandtrust.org/)

[Home \(http://greatlandtrust.org\)](http://greatlandtrust.org) → [Projects \(http://greatlandtrust.org/projects\)](http://greatlandtrust.org/projects) → [Swan "Quggesh" Lake Boardwalk & Trail](#)

SEARCH PROJECTS

[VIEW PROJECT MAP](http://greatlandtrust.org/projects/) [\(http://greatlandtrust.org/projects/\)](http://greatlandtrust.org/projects/)

SWAN "QUGGESH" LAKE BOARDWALK & TRAIL

A new trail in the Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge is now open to the public!



In 2014, Great Land Trust raised \$1.5 million to purchase nearly 1,000 acres of private land – making the largest private inholding within the Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge open to the public. Next GLT raised money to build wetland boardwalks out into the Refuge from two different trailheads, providing stunning and never before seen views and access to fishing and wildlife watching spots.

The nearby Wasilla Creek Boardwalk & Trail opened in 2016, while we waited on opening the Swan Lake Boardwalk & Trail until the adjacent housing development was completed. This spring, the access to Swan Lake was opened and Fish & Game staff built a connector trail out to the road, and the Swan Lake Boardwalk & Trail are public!



PC179
7 of 8

If you've enjoyed the Wasilla Creek Boardwalk & Trail, you'll love visiting Swan Lake. A trail to the south takes you down a boardwalk and out to the viewing platform at Swan Lake where you'll get views of the Palmer Hay Flats and the Chugach Mountains in the distance. A trail to the north takes you on a 1-mile upland loop through a beautiful birch forest, with more views from the bluff out into the Refuge. The area is also the location of a former Dena'ina village site and holds cultural significance. The area is called *Quggesh*, which means swan.



GETTING THERE: From Anchorage, take the Glenn Highway north towards Wasilla. Take the Trunk Road exit and turn left onto Trunk Rd. Go through the traffic circle and take the exit onto South Trunk Road. Follow South Trunk Road as it becomes E. Nelson Road. Follow E. Nelson Road past the Wasilla Creek Trail parking lot until you see Machetan Elementary School on your right. Just past Machetan Elementary, take a left onto S. Barn Gable Loop (you will have already passed the other end of this loop), and the trailhead is just down the hill on your right. Look for the trailhead sign. Park along the right side of the roadway. NOTE: This section of S. Barn Gable Loop is a new road and is not yet visible on Google Maps.

Swan "Quggesh" Lake Trails

Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge



This project was made possible through funding from the Alaska Conservation Foundation, the Alaska Waterfowl Association, ConocoPhillips, The Conservation Fund, ERM Group Foundation, Gateway Community Council, JL Properties, Mat-Su Trails & Parks Foundation, M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust, National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, NOAA, Rasmuson Foundation, Wildlife & Sport Fish Restoration Program, and many generous individual donations.

SEARCH

[Home \(http://greatlandtrust.org/\)](http://greatlandtrust.org/) | [Contact \(https://greatlandtrust.org/connect/\)](https://greatlandtrust.org/connect/) | [Sitemap \(https://greatlandtrust.org/sitemap/\)](https://greatlandtrust.org/sitemap/)

© 2022 Great Land Trust



[\(http://www.pickclickgive.org/\)](http://www.pickclickgive.org/)

[\(http://www.landtrustaccreditation.org/\)](http://www.landtrustaccreditation.org/)



Submitted By
Lorraine Temple
Submitted On
2/18/2022 7:46:17 PM
Affiliation
Cooper Landing Community Safe Trails

Phone
907-299-2855
Email
lthuskys@gmail.com
Address
PO Box 652
Cooper Landing, Alaska 99572

I am in complete agreement Proposal 199 of *at least* a 50 yard set back on the listed trails, recreation areas, pullouts and roads. The dogs caught in traps recently, and what has happened historically, are strong indicators that these conflicts need to be addressed. These dogs are more like important family members ;that grow up with kids in the household; these events are heartbreaking and unnecessary. The days of useful trapping for clothing and food are long gone; the lifestyle today of Alaskans is certainly more recreational than the other. Tourism is booming and winter activities that utilize the trails consist of skiers, snowshoers, snowmachiners, hikers, fat tire bikers, dog mushers and most of these groups have their dogs running free along side them. This is a natural, healthy, expected excercise for the family and groups. When I was dog mushing in the Homer area, I always let a few dogs run along side for more training. I shudder to think today of doing that and can only think that my loose huskies stayed safe because back in the 80's, perhaps trappers were more ethical of where to place their traps. There seems to be a variety of "hobby trappers" that are spoiling it for the rest of the folks that are more sensitive to the issue. With this bad reputation that is growing exponentially regarding trappers, it seems to me that completely eliminating trapping in the state of Alaska could be the next move by the masses. I'm sure the current respectful trappers don't want that. In Cooper Landing, a survey was put out with 90% of the returned questionnaires supporting a 400 yard set back, and some said they wanted as much as a mile. The multi use areas should simply *not* allow trapping and on the other hand, areas whould be posted with signs indicating active traps to alert recreational users. There is enough land and back country to accomodate all users safely. The time for change is immediate and necessary. Things have changed in our great state and we need to change with the times.



Submitted By

Chris Thomas

Submitted On

2/18/2022 4:58:04 PM

Affiliation

Phone

9076327319

Email

thomas_scott@asdk12.org

Address

1852 E 24th Ave

Anchorage, Alaska 99508

I fully support 199. Christmas eve 12/24/21, I had a dog caught in a snare on the Moose Range Trails. Dog was no more than 10 yards off the ski trail. The potential for serious user conflicts is far too high. Please vote in favor of 199.



Submitted By
Henry D Tiffany IV
Submitted On
2/17/2022 11:57:17 AM
Affiliation
Self

Phone
907-223-3226
Email
henrydtiffanyiv@yahoo.com
Address
PO Box 328
Ester, Alaska 99725

Dear Board of Game Members,

As a lifelong Alaskan resident, professional Master Big Game Guide & Outfitter and former chairman of the State of Alaska Big Game Commercial Services Board, I would like to comment on a few of the many proposals before you, specifically proposals 135 through 137 that seek to repeal 207, a law which makes it illegal to spot and locate Dall sheep during the Dall sheep hunting season of August 10th to September 20th. I would like to reiterate my continued, longtime support of this law, which was originally Board of Game generated proposal 207, and if often referenced as such. This law has had a very beneficial, positive effect on all ethical sport hunters and the experiences of all hunters and user groups enjoying our wild places and natural resources.

The argument has, and will, be made that this law is unenforceable, and I would suggest that is not entirely the case. In our current day and age of technology almost everyone is carrying with them a "smart phone" and more and more I am seeing hunters (resident, non-resident and guides alike) carrying these phones into the field on a daily basis. As such, everyone is carrying a video camera with them as well, since most all of these advanced phones can, and do, easily take video footage. As such, it does not take much effort to capture in video, or in photo, format flying behavior that is not ethical and/or is contrary to the language and intent of this law. That footage, and an accompanying complaint, can then be turned into the proper authorities to be investigated. While this law (207) might not prevent all such behavior I do believe it does help to curb the misuse of aircraft and since its inception my hunting experiences, and those of my clients, have been much better than before this became a law.

Instead of trying to repeal, or somehow weaken, this law I encourage you to strongly consider enhancing, and making 207 truly enforceable, and more closely adherent to the ethical, fair-chase ethos, which should encompass all sport hunting in Alaska. This law should in fact be expanded to fully include all big game species in Alaska instead of trying to reduce its effectiveness and I would fully support making it illegal to spot and locate any big game species from aircraft. That does not mean pilots and/or passengers should fly with their eyes closed and of course some big game species would be incidentally spotted while flying to and from remote locations but the intent behind this law is noble and makes it illegal to actively fly around looking for, spotting and locating Dall sheep and our hunting future could only be improved if it were expanded to include all big game species and by doing so it would make it much more enforceable.

At a minimum, I am in full support of proposal 138, which broadens 207 to include all open sheep seasons, including youth seasons. The youth is the future of hunting and we should be making every effort to instill in our youth proper, ethical and sportsmanlike behavior, which does NOT include spotting game from the air to then pursue it.

I do not see abiding by this law, or an expansion of this law, as a hardship or undue burden by any means because the majority of resident hunters, and a reasonable percentage of guides, have been successfully hunting sheep ethically and under the fair-chase clause for many decades so it can be done, as is proven every year by those hunters that harvest rams WITHOUT first having to spot them from the air. It would be a real travesty were you, the Board of Game, to even consider rescinding this 207 law, much less actually doing so.

I thank you, board members, for your continued service to our state, its people and its resources and appreciate the time, effort and diligence you bring to your efforts and decisions.

Respectfully,

Henry D. Tiffany IV



Submitted By
Henry D Tiffany IV
Submitted On
2/18/2022 6:33:30 AM
Affiliation
Self

Phone
907-223-3226
Email
henrydtiffanyiv@yahoo.com
Address
PO Box 328
Ester, Alaska 99725

Dear Board of Game Members,

RE: Reconsideration of Proposal 206, Opposition to Proposals 151, 168, 241 and 267 and Support of Proposals 149, 159, 163 and 164

As a lifelong Alaskan and Master Guide with over 30 years of in-the-field experience hunting on the southern Alaska Peninsula, specifically in GMU 9D and 9E, I strongly urge you to please reconsider your adoption of Proposal 206, which extends the Brown Bear Spring Seasons in 9D and 9E until May 31st. I do not believe this is in the best interests of conservation or the resources.

Traditionally, at least since the 1980's, the Resident and Non-Resident Brown Seasons on the southern Peninsula were 15-to-16-day seasons and I believe that served conservation, the hunters, and the resources well and produced a high quality, sustainable harvest. Several years ago, due to pressure from some user groups, both the fall and spring seasons were lengthened and then most recently, just a few years ago, you reduced the season back to what it has traditionally been based upon conservation concerns. I was, and remain, in full support of that decision and I am strongly opposed to lengthening the season for any user group. You just reduced the season and now you are prepared to lengthen it again? That makes no sense to me and does not seem to be based upon sound, prudent resource management, data, or conservation.

Please, I implore you to reconsider the recent change to 206 and do not add any additional length to the season in units 9D and 9E and revert it back to the long standing, traditional October 7th to 21st and May 10th to 25th season dates.

I would also like to voice my strong **opposition** to Proposals 267, 151, 168 and 241 and my **support** of Proposals 149, 159, 163 and 164.

I thank you, board members, for your continued service to our state, its people and its resources and appreciate the time, effort, and diligence you bring to your efforts and decisions.

Respectfully,

Henry D. Tiffany IV

Master Guide #144

P.O. Box 329

Ester, Alaska 99725



Submitted By
Kathleen Tigan
Submitted On
2/7/2022 8:05:06 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9722158251
Email
tigan.k@gmail.com
Address
1240 Serpentine Road
Reno, Nevada 89506

Alaska has approximately 30 licensed falconers, EACH of which can legally, take 2 wild Raptors of any species, at any time of each calendar year.

Alaska Falconers propose, in part, that the entirety of the roughly 4,500 licensed Falconers in the lower 48 be granted a total of ONLY 5 wild take permits EVERY FOUR YEARS – AND that ONLY non-residents be required to microchip. Additionally, ONLY non-resident trapping dates be September 15 through November 15, which is past a historic trapping time when weather conditions greatly reduce success, accessibility, and safety.

In comparison, Texas, being 2.5 times smaller than Alaska, with approximately 400 licensed, resident Falconers and each is granted 2 wild takes per year in addition to also allowing non-residents one wild raptor within that same year. Texas also makes an exception for Peregrines, a species as highly valued by Falconers as the Gyrfalcon by allowing 35 takes from September 20 through October 20, with a 60/40 split (resident /non-resident), in the three Federally approved Texas flyways.

With regards to Alaska, an argument can also be made that per capita, it is easier and safer to draw, trap and fly a Golden Eagle than it is to trap a Gyrfalcon.

The regulations proposed by the Alaska Falconers Association and Alaska Department of Fish and Game single out and seek to disparage Falconers in the lower 48 by overly complicating the process, greatly increasing our expenses and significantly reduce the number of take permits.

We respectfully request your consideration in supporting California Hawking Clubs submission of proposal #113 as a more reasonable solution.



Submitted By
Henry Titus
Submitted On
1/10/2022 12:04:49 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9076382111
Email
henryjack_4@hotmail.com
Address
PO Box 84054
White Mountain, Alaska 99784-0054

Proposal 120

Proxy Hunt Authorization for "any" antlered bull.

Hunting traditional foods for elders, now known as proxy hunting, has been our tradition and our culture. Continuing our tradition and our culture is being impacted by restrictions to proxy hunting in the winter moose hunt in unit 22.

We do not expect our elderly that have once provided for us as children to hunt big game, such as moose. They are elderly and most with restrictions themselves, such as lifting and even riding a snowmobile for periods of time.

I feel it is time to lift this restriction to proxy hunting during the winter moose hunt. To take proxy hunting away from us, is taking a part of who we are as Inupit and a part of our tradition and culture. This is a fact for many indigenous cultures throughout the world. I strongly advise restrictions to proxy hunting to be lifted so we may continue on with our tradition and culture through "proxy hunting."

Quyana/Chin'an gu nin yu/Basi// Thank You!

Henry J Titus Sr.



Submitted By
JoAnna Tomuro
Submitted On
2/15/2022 1:51:45 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9077829299
Email
joanna.tomuro@gmail.com
Address
PO Box 190664
Anchorage, Alaska 99519

I would like to amend my statement from yesterday 2/14 (copied below), by adding I wish to support Proposal 144. I was mistaken to state it to be stricken. I am in support of TNVR. Thank you, JoAnna Tomuro 2/15/2022

Statement submitted 2/14/2022: I would like to move to strike down Proposal 144 as it exempts sterilized cats from from being released into the community. I support TNVR (trap-neuter-vaccinate-return) as the city has ignored the over-population of cats and dogs in our community with lack of education and lack of truly free or low cost spay neuter resources for the general public. TNVR works to curb the population of unwanted animals in our community, it has been proven in many communities outside Alaska. To be clear, I only support the releasing of sterilized cats back to the community where there is a cat caretaker - a caretaker who feeds and waters, provides shelter and monitors the cats for injury or illness.

Submitted By
JoAnna Tomuro
Submitted On
2/14/2022 2:24:53 PM
Affiliation
Independent Rescuer

Phone
9077829299
Email
joanna.tomuro@gmail.com
Address
PO Box 190664
Anchorage, Alaska 99519

I would like to move to stike down Proposal 144 as it exempts sterilized cats from from being released into the community. I support TNVR (trap-neuter-vaccinate-return) as the city has ignored the over-population of cats and dogs in our community with lack of education and lack of truly free or low cost spay neuter resources for the general public. TNVR works to curb the population of unwanted animals in our community, it has been proven in many communities outside Alaska. To be clear, I only support the releasing of sterlized cats back to the community where there is a cat caretaker - a caretaker who feeds and waters, provides shelter and monitors the cats for injury or illness.



Submitted By
Ed Toribio
Submitted On
2/18/2022 9:26:41 PM
Affiliation
APHA - Alaska guide

Phone
907-254-8620
Email
primo@kpunet.net
Address
PO Box 6743
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Proposal 135: I support this proposal 135 and agree with the the wording in Proposal # 139 "aircraft may no be used to make multiple consecutive approaches near aany sheep or group of sheep,..." as a better alternative.

Proposal 136: I support this proposal and feel that the the wording in Proposal 139 " aircraft may not be used to make multiple consecutive approaches neat any sheep or group of sheep...during the open sheep season..." is a better solution to the issue.

Proposal 137: I support this proposal and feel that the wording in Proposal 139; "aircraft may not be used to make multiple consecutive aproaches near any sheep or group of sheep...during an open sheep season..." is a better solution to this issue.

Proposal 138: I OPPOSE this proposal.

Proposal 139: I SUPPORT this proposal.

Submitted By
Angela Torres
Submitted On
2/14/2022 6:04:34 PM
Affiliation



PC187
1 of 1

Please, support Proposal 144 and exempt sterilized community cats from the list of species prohibited from being released into the wild. TNVR programs are good for cats and good for communities. Thank you.



Submitted By
Bill mohrwinkel
Submitted On
2/18/2022 4:34:27 PM
Affiliation
Valley Mountain Bikers and Hikers

Phone
9072323217
Email
bill.mohrwinkel@gmail.com
Address
20512 E Tempa St
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Valley Mountain Bikers and Hikers supports proposal 199 to create 50 yard set backs on trails in the Matanuska Susitna Borough. VMBAH is a nonprofit organization that builds and maintains trails throughout the Mat-Su Borough. The Mat-Su borough is and has been for many years, the fastest growing area in Alaska. Because there are many more people in the Valley, there are many more people out using trails. Trapping is not an activity that is compatible with other users, especially those with their pet dogs. Trapping should be done well away from high use areas. While most trappers are ethical, many are not, hence the need for regulations.

Many trappers answer to this problem is to simply put your dog on a leash. While there is a leash law on Mat-Su borough lands, many trails do not require leashes. And even with leash laws, many people run their dog off-leash. This is common knowledge. While there are many areas where dogs should be leashed and even certain dogs that should be always leashed on public trails, trappers should acknowledge this and not trap where they could catch a loose dog in a trap. People are always amazed that trapping is legal just about anywhere. They assume there are laws that keep trapping away from trails and parks. Unfortunately, many dogs pay with their life because of this misconception. While this regulation will not prevent an unethical trapper from trapping less than 50 yards on a trail, at least there would be some legal recourse to remove the dangerous trap.

Although there are a handful of popular trails included in this proposal, Valley Mountain Bikers and Hikers does not think enough trails were included.

While trapping has historically been an important part of Alaska's history, unethical, weekend hobby trappers, using our trails and road system as a "trapline" has become a problem. Trapping is an activity that should be done well away from high-use areas and as our population increases in the Mat-Su Valley, it's time for regulations to protect other users, not just trappers.

There have been several dogs caught in traps on popular trails this winter.

The Board of Game can no longer turn a blind eye to this problem. It's only going to get worse. Please pass Proposal 199 and create 50 yard setbacks on trails in the Mat-Su.

Submitted By
Mike Vaughn
Submitted On
2/17/2022 10:20:26 PM
Affiliation
Waterfowl hunter



PC189
1 of 1

Members of the Board of Game,

I am submitting this comment in **SUPPORT** of **Proposal 231** which requests a re-evaluation of the definition of edible meat for cranes, geese, and swans. I would like to thank the proposer for bringing this issue forward and for the Board's consideration of this and the other proposals before you.

Admittedly, I have not hunted tundra swans, nor have I been involved in preparing swans for consumption but it stands to reason they carry a lot more useable "secondary" meat and the large game bird meat salvage requirements seem that they are likely appropriate. I do however think we have gotten a little sideways in this regulation when it comes to required retention of the back section of waterfowl and with the broad assignment of additional salvage requirements to vastly different groups of birds that fall into the generic goose category. A 2.9 lb average weight brant or 4.2 lb average cackling goose is in an entirely different league than a full size Canada goose, or a tundra swan, which may grow to 23 lb.

I certainly want to be a responsible and respectful user of the game I harvest but some of the salvage requirements, particularly when considered for these smaller geese, seem more like "feel good" motions rather than regulations of substance. I can get behind and support the recovery of secondary meat sources in the thighs and upper section of the wings where there is edible meat to be utilized, but I am in agreement with the proposer that the back section of a goose does not meet that standard.

Thank you-

Mike Vaughn



Submitted By
Linda von Bose
Submitted On
2/14/2022 2:33:10 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9076324797

Email
akforgottenfelines@gmail.com

Address
PO Box 671496
22335 Inlet Vista Circle
Chugiak, Alaska 99567

Southcentral Alaska has an overwhelming number of unaltered cats living outside. **THE ONLY WAY WE ARE GOING TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT IS BY TRAP/NEUTER/VACCINATE AND RETURN. There is no other effective way to do it. I STRONGLY SUPPORT Proposal 144, TNVR and the exemption of sterilized cats from the list of species prohibited from being released to the wild.** In reality, those cats deemed not adoptable would be released back to the location/home they are already inhabiting and where there is a caretaker and shelter for them....not simply dumped 'out in the wild'. I've been doing rescue for nearly 18years and have done extensive trapping as well as colony control and in some cases, elimination. TNVR along with aggressive Spay/Neuter programs are critical management tools we must have!



Submitted By
Kyle L Wait
Submitted On
12/7/2021 11:16:04 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9077483393
Email
bowhuntak@yahoo.com
Address
13858 E Doc McKinley Ave
Palmer, Alaska 99645-7695

Proposal 123, Electronic Rangefinders mounted to bows

These bow mounted rangefinders are very efficient! And that is why we should not allow them to be used. Archery hunting is based on limitations. The more we erode the limitations the more efficient we become. The more efficient we become the more game we harvest, forcing the board to limit opportunity. The changes allowed in archery in recent years have been reasonable and responsible without aiding archers too much. Bow mounted rangefinders might very well cross that line, the line that keeps us limited and respected. Alaska will not suffer any loss of bowhunting participation by continuing to ban electronic equipment being mounted to bows.

Proposal 137, Observing sheep from an aircraft during an open season.

I was frustrated and disapointed when the BOG took it upon themselves to propose and push regulation against public opinion. This was over reach and just plain wrong. Members can talk of intent or reason all day long but the fact remains, our BOG acted more like our current government than an appointed body charged with upholding public process.

Was this really ever an issue? Well my first 15 years in Alaska I didnt have a plane and I sheep hunted almost every year. Never once did I have an aircraft impact my hunt. I think we can all agree this tool can get misused / abused to the detriment of others. Those that abuse the tool should have been dealt with accordingly under existing laws forbidding the harrassment of wildlife. But a law that makes an honest sportsman illegal because he spotted a sheep while flying through a valley is upsurd. Am I supose to fly blindfolded? Viewing a sheep from a quarter mile away is not unsportsman like nor will it impact anyones hunt. Violators could have been dealt with under existing laws without creating new, impossible, overreaching regulation that was generated and passed in house! I hope we have learned our lesson about "working groups"!

Repeal Prop 206 by carrying this Proposal 137. Put some teeth in existing regulation regarding wildlife harrasssment and deal with unsportsmanlike conduct accordingly.

Kyle Wait, Palmer Alaska.

Submitted By
Jeanne Walker
Submitted On
2/18/2022 9:51:36 AM
Affiliation



PC192
1 of 1

I am dismayed that there are no trail setbacks on trap lines in Alaska. Please adopt the current proposal (199) to ensure safer trails for all users.



Submitted By
Barbara Warfield
Submitted On
2/9/2022 2:24:50 PM
Affiliation

Phone
208.866.6011
Email
bawarfield@aol.com
Address
7750 w preece dr
boise, Idaho 83704

Regarding Proposal #265

My name is Barbara Warfield and my community of residence is Boise, Idaho.

I am writing in **Support** of proposal # 265 changing RM855 to DM 855.

I find the process for applying for a non-resident moose tag in Unit 22E very complicated and the process unfair.

It requires being super adept on the computer and keyboard since those wishing to compete for the available tags must do so at the same **exact moment** on July 7th at 0900 when the ADF&G opens it to receive and award registration permits to the first electronic applications they receive.

This method is unfair because: **1)** puts older individuals who may have slower fingers or not skilled at the computer at an unfair disadvantage; **2)** speed of transmission of mobile technology is not the same for everyone from different parts of the country; **3)** many older hunters do not have access to a reliable computer or internet at their residence. **4)** there will be those super skilled at technology who may use multiple computers, and if possible set for a scheduled automatic transmission of the form or automatic recurring transmission of the form.

For the above reasons, I feel that the current method of obtaining a non-resident moose tag in Unit 22E are a barrier for many and perhaps discriminatory.

Because of this, **I urge you to approve Proposal #265 and take action for this regulatory year and changing it to a draw system on July 7, 2022 so this unfairness can be rectified for the year 2022 by a "draw system as described in Proposal #265.**

Thank you for your consideration.



Submitted By
Andrew Weaver
Submitted On
2/18/2022 3:41:02 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9076318114
Email
dreamstrails@yahoo.com
Address
9370 E. Santa Fe Circle
Palmer, Alaska 99645

I write to oppose Statewide Regulation Proposal #267, which seeks to restrict nonresident sheep hunting in Game Unit 19C so that only resident sheep hunting is allowed. Proposal #267 should be rejected for the following reasons.

(1) Proposal #267 is bad for Alaska's businesses, jobs, and economy.

I've operated as Registered Guide in Unit 19C for years. Our outfitting business financially supports numerous guides, assistants, and other trades and businesses involved in the hunting and outfitting industries. Our outfitting business relies on nonresident sheep hunting in Unit 19C. If approved, Proposal #267 will not only shut-down our business, and hurt all the businesses, trades, jobs, and livelihoods that depend on our business, it will also shut down all other outfitters currently providing hunts in Unit 19C

Even worse, the damaging effects of Proposal #267 will spread throughout Alaska to all those who financially depend on or benefit from nonresident hunters.

Nonresident hunters are one of the biggest revenues for the state. Non resident hunters visiting Alaska financially support vast sectors of Alaska's economy, including industries in tourism, travel, lodging, food and beverage, shopping, hunting, and guiding. From these vast sectors of Alaska's economy, a wide-range of Alaska businesses and jobs financially depend on or benefit from nonresident hunters, including aircraft transportation, motor vehicle rentals, gas stations, hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, grocery stores, convenience stores, liquor stores, restaurants, bars, sporting goods stores, equipment stores, clothing stores, hunting guides, outfitters, and taxidermists. Since Proposal #267 seeks to restrict nonresident hunters, it will hurt Alaska's businesses, cut jobs, and damage the economy.

(2) Proposal #267 is bad for responsible sheep management in Unit 19C.

Proposal #267 will reduce the number of outfitters operating nonresident sheep hunting in Unit 19C. As business owners and employees who depend on the opportunity to guide sheep hunts, we take very seriously what happens in our units. We love Alaska and make business practices to protect and preserve the sheep population.

The State of Alaska has successfully managed sheep using the full curl or 8 year old method for years throughout the state. Outfitters have built their business models around this method and offered outfitting services accordingly.

Proposal #267 has nothing to do with increasing sheep numbers and has everything to do with wrongful entitlements by a small group of Alaskans. Sheep meeting the full curl or 8 year old test are the target of all hunters. If there is no full curl or 8 year old rams then no sheep will be taken during the season. The population of sheep will increase until a sustainable population of full curl or 8 year old rams exist.

It is important to remember, it was not nonresident hunters that caused the sheep decline but harsh winters. The outfitters operating in Unit 19C provide responsible sheep management because their businesses depend on it.



The individuals in support of Proposal #267 should consider their impact on sheep populations. Where will this end? It needs to be on their wall? Nonresidents are required to wait 4 years between successful hunts, why is the concerned party not suggesting residents do the same to support sheep populations. As far as funding goes, here is another area the supporting parties of Proposal #267 fail to provide money where their mouth is. Increase the price of sheep tags to reflect every other state that offers opportunities to hunt Wild Sheep. This should go for both Residents and Nonresidents. The additional revenue generated from residents would greatly assist in management and preservation of a resource they consider their own. Everyone should pay to play when it comes to utilizing a resource.

(3) Proposal #267 is bad for all sheep management state wide.

Proposal #267 if approved will accomplish one thing and one thing only. Displacement of Outfitters and Nonresidents. The demand on this resource will not go away, and the need for Outfitters to provide for their families will not stop. If Proposal #267 passes you will see sheep populations in other areas of the state feel the impact. Both Outfitters and Nonresidents will move to areas where they can operate and hunt sheep thus compounding the problem. Proposal #267 is not the answer to a low sheep population it is simply the catalyst to more areas in Alaska dealing with a similar problem if a bad winter should hit.

Best Regards,

Andrew Weaver

Guide #1283



Alaska Board of Game

1 of 5

Proposals to: Statewide Regulations

Comments to Proposals.

Submitted by: Brian West

1000 Oceanview Dr.

Anch Ak 99515

Proposal 101. OPPOSE. Inability of an individual to draw a bow should not be the basis for adding a crossbow to the archery definition. At shorter ranges a cross bow, at least a modern crossbow, is effectively a rifle.

Proposal 102. OPPOSE. I see no reason why Alaska should be like every other state. Additionally, shotguns and muzzleloaders are not primitive weapons. Modern muzzleloaders are highly accurate and have long range capabilities. A shotgun is able to fire successive rounds as fast or faster than a bolt action rifle. It is also the most effective weapon for hunting fowl. It is not a primitive weapon.

Proposal 103

Hunting gear should include everything used for the hunt to include feed for animals used for transport, especially as horses/mules are used in many non-motorized areas.



Board of Game, Comments to Proposed Statewide Regulations

2 of 5

Proposal 115. SUPPORT

Proposal 119. SUPPORT

Proposal 121. OPPOSE.

Proposal 123. OPPOSE. People want a special hunt to limit competition, in this case primitive weapons. However, this proposer wishes to make his primitive weapon as modern as possible. At some point the weapon is no longer primitive.

Proposal 124. OPPOSE.

Proposal 125. OPPOSE. Modern cross bows are not truly primitive weapons and should not be allowed in such hunts.

Proposal 126. OPPOSE. With modern muzzle loaders it is hard to justify them as primitive weapons. These special hunts were set up to provide opportunity outside the general hunt with weapons that provided for limited success. Muzzleloaders are effectively a single shot rifle, ways should not be provided to make them more effective and in doing so compete with hunters in the general season. Nothing prevents a person from using these



Board of Game Comments to Proposals

3 of 5

Proposal 126 CONTINUED
modified weapons in the general hunt.

Proposal 127. OPPOSE. I have to wonder how effective an air rifle would be on a bear.

Proposal 128. SUPPORT

Proposal 129. SUPPORT

Proposal 146. OPPOSE. Acquiring multiple perm permits does not limit the opportunity for other hunters as the number of registration permits is not limited.

Proposal 147. SUPPORT

Proposal 148. SUPPORT

Proposal 149. OPPOSE. State law allows a non-resident hunter to hunt with a relative instead of a guide. If a non-resident should draw a tag for sheep he is allowed to bypass the guide and hunt with a relative, that is their right. The Board of Game has no authority to infringe upon that right.



Board of Game, Comments to Proposals Statewide Regulations

4 of 5

Proposal 151 - SUPPORT. Add that permits are also available at Fish & Game offices in Anchorage, Fairbanks etc.

These requirements are blatantly biased. They are used because a drawing permit cannot insure that the vast majority of permits go to local residents.

Proposal 153. OPPOSE. The most equitable form of permit distribution is through a random drawing. Everyone has an equal chance. The bigger question is why are non-residents being given permits?

Proposal 154. SUPPORT

Proposal 155. SUPPORT

Proposal 156. OPPOSE. Handicapped individuals should be treated just like everyone else. Their handicap is unfortunate, but, that does not mean they should be granted special privileges.

Proposal 168. SUPPORT. The Board has overstepped its authority on this issue.



Board of Game, Comments to Proposals Statewide Regulations

5 of 5

Proposal 169. **OPPOSE.** You cannot require a person to adhere to some one else's religious beliefs. If hunting a particular animal is banned for a religious belief, all hunting will be banned to abide by other religious beliefs.



Submitted By
Vern Cleveland
Submitted On
2/3/2022 3:56:26 PM
Affiliation
Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group

February 3, 2022

ATTN: Board of Game Comments

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Boards Support Section

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(Submitted via online portal)

SUBJECT: Board of Game Proposal 245

To the Alaska Board of Game:

At its December 15, 2021 meeting, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group voted to submit a comment to the Alaska Board of Game regarding the following regulatory proposal.

PROPOSAL 245 – 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.

Proposal 245 would eliminate the current requirement in 5 AAC 92.220(d)(3) that rib meat for moose, caribou and bison must remain naturally attached to the bone until the meat has been transported from the field or is processed for human consumption.

Comment: The WACH Working Group voted unanimously to **not support Proposal 245**.

On behalf of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, I thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Regards,

Vern Cleveland, Sr., Chair

Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group



Submitted By
Jack Reakoff
Submitted On
1/18/2022 4:53:57 PM
Affiliation
Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

Phone
907-474-2270
Email
karen_deatherage@fws.gov
Address
Office of Subsistence Management, USFWS
1011 E. Tudor Road, MS 121
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

In Reply Refer to:
RAC.WI.22002.KD

Stosh (Stanley) Hoffman, Chair
ATTN: Board of Game Comments
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
PO Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Dear Chairman Hoffman:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (Council) to provide comments on proposals coming before the Alaska Board of Game (BOG) Statewide Regulations meeting scheduled for March 4-11, 2022 in Fairbanks.

The Council represents subsistence harvesters of fish and wildlife resources on Federal public lands and waters in Western Interior Alaska. It was established by the authority in Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Section 805 of ANILCA and the Council's charter establishes 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 their regions that may impact 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.

The Council held a public meeting, October 14-15, 2021, via teleconference due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Among the items discussed were BOG proposals that would affect subsistence users and resources in the Western Interior Alaska Region. The Council discussed and voted to submit the following comments to the BOG for consideration as it deliberates these proposals:

Proposal 172: 5 AAC 92.530. Clarify the legal use of highway vehicles, snow machines and off-road vehicles in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) for hunting and trapping. Clarify the use of firearms, and transport of furbearers and trapping bait when trapping in the DHCMA.

Council recommendation: The Council voted unanimously to SUPPORT this proposal WITH MODIFICATION.

Council comments:

The Council wishes to reiterate its comments submitted for the 2019/2020 Board of Game Proposal 64. The sole purpose of the described area in Alaska Statutes was to protect big game populations. The Council supports the premise of the proposal to clarify use parameters of the DHCMA, and believes the BOG is the best management body to address enforcement and other issues brought forth by law officers and the public. The Council voted to amend Proposal 172 by replacing language with the following, which were also discussed and submitted by the Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee:

1) Clarification to allow snowmachine use in the DHCMA for both access to traplines and the transport of legally defined big game bait. Licensed trapping is a very important management tool to harvest furbearers under trapping regulations. Travel to and from homes within or outside of the DHCMA by licensed trappers should not be impeded. Firearms to take free-ranging furbearers has always been allowed in the DHCMA under a trapping license, and should continue. Restricting trappers' ability to take predators would be detrimental to big game populations, and could cause the reduction of opportunity for subsistence and other users.

2) Clarification to allow residents north of the Yukon River to travel to their homes from the Dalton Highway. The residents of Wiseman, Coldfoot, Stevens Village, Anaktuvuk Pass, Allakaket, Alatna, Evensville, Bettles, and Nuiqsut should be permitted to travel from the Dalton Highway to their homes with legally taken big game. Access by residents using licensed highway vehicles should be allowed on

year round or winter roads to these villages in order to transport game, game parts, hunters or hunting gear, as defined. Specifically, residents should have access to the oil field roads to Nuiqsut, the winter roads to Stevens Village, Anaktuvuk Pass, Evansville, Allakaket, and Alatna, and the year round road to property and businesses in Wiseman.



3) Clarification to allow licensed highway vehicles to transport hunters, game, game parts, and gear within 1 mile of the Dalton Highway. The current ¼-mile restriction does not allow subsistence and other hunters to access boat-launching sites into the Koyukuk and Sag River drainages that have side road access outside of the quarter mile limit. Some hunters are currently accessing legal boat launch sites up to 18 river miles from logical accesses.

The Council does not support additional clarifying language within the original proposal; namely, the five bullet points on pages 207 and 208 of the BOG Proposal book. There is insufficient information provided as to what that clarifying language would be, and the impacts of any such language to subsistence uses within the DHMCA.

Finally, the Council wishes to convey that its support for any clarifying language via Proposal 172 is based upon Alaska Statute protection of big game primarily, but also other fish and wildlife resources. The Council's concern is for Federally qualified subsistence users who reside in or near the DHCMA whose homes and subsistence harvest is critical to their lifeway, as well as non-Federally qualified users who are protected under ANILCA Title VIII sec. 815. Further, any actions or clarifying language proposed by the BOG under this proposal should not be interpreted as taking away the rights afforded to subsistence users under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and/or the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Proposal 173: 5 AAC 92.530(7). Repeal the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area. Council recommendation:

The Council voted unanimously to OPPOSE this proposal.

Council comments: The Council wishes to reiterate its comments submitted for the 2019/2020 Board of Game Proposal 63. The Council strongly believes that the Alaska Board of Game's Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) regulation is the most effective way to ensure enforcement of game management. Hunters and others rely on ADF&G regulations versus broad state statute as a much more reliable way to understand activities permitted in the DHCMA. Law enforcement can also enforce the BOG regulations for illegal activities. The BOG is tasked with game management within the statutorily delineated GMUs comprising the DHCMA.

The Council thanks the BOG for considering these comments, which reflect the importance of conserving healthy wildlife populations and providing for the continuation of subsistence uses in the Western Interior Alaska region. We look forward to continuing discussions with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and 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:

Federal Subsistence Board
Office of Subsistence Management
Benjamin Mulligan, Deputy Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Mark Burch, Special Projects Coordinator, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
Interagency Staff Committee
Administrative Record



Submitted By
Rachel L White
Submitted On
2/18/2022 7:54:07 AM
Affiliation

Phone
8177077582
Email
rwhite_1st@yahoo.com

Address
13817 Malaspina Street
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

I am in support of Proposal 144. This proposal will exempt sterilized cats from the list of species prohibited from being released into the wild — i.e., the “return” part of trap-neuter-vaccinate-return (TNVR). Rule changes that do not impede TNVR programs will be better for the cats, better for public health, and better for the wildlife we all want to protect. Feral and stray cats already live outdoors and some are never going to be able to be adopted into homes and families because they are not socialized. Instead of leaving these cats to reproduce outside and create more unsocialized cats in the area, and instead of euthanizing all the cats that are not adoptable, TNVR would allow these cats to live out their remaining years without reproducing. Please support this proposal to exempt sterilized cats from being returned to locations where they already live.



Dear Board of Game members,

Thank you for your service!

My name is Kurt Whitehead, Master Guide #211. My wife Trina Nation is an assistant guide as well and we both own and operate a small hunting and fishing lodge on Prince of Wales Island near Klawock, AK. We offer fully guided saltwater fishing trips and fully guided hunts in GMU 2. We are both, year round, full time, snow shoveling, real Alaskan residents. I serve as Secretary for the East PoW AC, Klawock AC and Craig AC. Below are my personal comments for the statewide BoG proposals.

Proposal 101-Oppose

Proposal 102-Oppose

Proposal 106-Support

Proposal 107-Support with the change of wording to Feral Cats

Proposal 230-Oppose due to conservation concerns. Passage of this prop will undoubtedly result in a higher harvest with is not what we need at this time due to low sheep numbers statewide.

Proposal 117-Support. Whatever we can do to help make AST job's easier is a good thing.

Proposal 118-Support. This will make for a better and safer hunter.

Proposal 121-Oppose. I am opposed to allowing dogs to hunt big game in AK other than for tracking wounded game.

Proposal 122-Oppose. This prop only makes sense for deer. It will result in higher wounding losses if passed.

Proposal 123-Support. This will result in lower wounding losses.

Proposal 124-Support. This will result in lower wounding losses.

Proposal 125-Oppose. This makes sense if the hunter is handicapped but leave the archery only hunts to bow and arrow hunters only.

Proposal 126-Uncertain on this because muzzle loaders can accurately be shot out to 250yds so I've got concerns with this one.

Proposal 129-Support. This will result in lower wounding losses.

Proposal 130-Support. Whatever we can do to keep CWD from coming to AK.

Proposal 131-Support as long as we don't have to redo the harvest requirements.

Proposal 132-Support as long as we don't have to redo the harvest requirements.

Proposal 133-Oppose. This will result in high wounding losses. Have you ever tried to shot a beaver with a rifle much less an arrow AND recover it? Good luck.

Proposal 135, 136, 137, 138, 139 The main goal with all these props should be to lower the harvest of our sheep due to the statewide conservation concerns.

Proposal 232-Support. Lowering wounding loss is always good.



Proposal 141-Oppose. If passed, this will create chaos and be an enforcement nightmare in SE Alaska but not in SE AK.

Proposal 144-Oppose. Releasing feral, bird killing, disease spreading cats back into the wild is a BAD idea.

Proposal 145-Support. Releasing feral, bird killing, disease spreading cats back into the wild is a BAD idea.

Proposal 147-Oppose. If passed, this would bring back market hunting to AK.

Proposal 149-Support. This is a good proposal.

Proposal 151-Oppose. RHAK is again formulating comments specifically to hurt guides. Who and what benefits from this prop if passed? The sooner we get a guide concession for state lands, the better off all Alaskans will be and hopefully RHAK will finally stop with their anti-guide rhetoric.

Proposal 154-Support.

Proposal 155-Support. This is a great proposal benefiting all Alaskans.

Proposal 156-Support.

Proposal 157-Support.

Proposal 239-Oppose.

Proposal 241-Oppose. Is there a conservation benefit to this proposal? No. Does this add value to our game resource? No.

Proposal 243-Support.

Proposal 159-Support.

Proposal 245-Oppose. I've salvaged many racks of moose ribs. The meat lasts much longer on the bone.

Proposal 163-Support.

Proposal 164-Support.

Proposal 247-Oppose.

Thank you!

Kurt Whitehead



Submitted By
Danielle Williams
Submitted On
2/17/2022 8:55:56 PM
Affiliation
Alaska resident

Phone
907-748-2347
Email
dsmithz_70@yahoo.com
Address
2029 Blueberry Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

Alaska Board of Game Members:

My name is Danielle Williams. I am an almost 30-year Anchorage resident who has spent a lot of time recreating on trails in the Mat-Su area with my dogs. I'm writing to support Proposal 199 which requests 50-yard trap setbacks on more than 200 multi-use trails in the Mat-Su area. I understand this distance is considered a "reasonable compromise" between user groups in other areas of Alaska.

Trail-users with dogs are a large stakeholder group for Mat-Su area trails, which is why it's difficult to understand how it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads and pullouts. The Mat-Su Valley (and Southcentral Alaska generally) is growing rapidly. There are many more people (including tourists) and dogs using these trails, campgrounds, roads and pullouts and the consequences are too great to not set traps back at least 50 yards.

Sadly, I have two different friends whose beloved dogs were caught in traps in the past couple of months on multi-use trails in Southcentral Alaska. One incident occurred on a popular Mat-Su area trail—gratefully my friend had a tool to release the trap. And though I recognize it's outside the scope of this proposal, it's worth mentioning that my other friend's dog died in a conibear trap near a trailhead on the Kenai Peninsula. It has been a heart-wrenching loss. I share this to demonstrate the impact of these traps near trails.

Please approve Proposal 199 and 50-yard trap setbacks on more than 200 multi-use trails in the Mat-Su area. I believe this is a more humane, safe and reasonable rule than what is currently in place for trapping in the Mat-Su area.

Thank you for your consideration.
Danielle Williams

Submitted By
freddie williams
Submitted On
2/17/2022 10:24:24 AM
Affiliation



PC201
1 of 1

Please support Proposal 144 and for TNVR programs. Board of Game support Proposal 144 and exempt sterilized community cats from the list of species prohibited from being released into the wild. TNVR programs are good for cats and good for communities.

Submitted By
Stephen Williams
Submitted On
2/17/2022 9:40:52 PM
Affiliation



PC202
1 of 1

Hello. My name is Stephen Williams. I support Proposal 199 which requests 50-yard trap setbacks on more than 200 multi-use trails in the Mat-Su area.

I am 29 year Alaska resident who spends a lot of time in the outdoors, including recreating on trails in the Mat-Su area with my dog. I understand and recognize there are multiple users of public spaces that must be considered. I believe the 50 yard distance is considered a "reasonable compromise" between user groups in other areas of Alaska.

Like myself, trail users with dogs are a large stakeholder group for Mat-Su area trails, which is why it's difficult to understand how it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, vehicle pullouts and campgrounds. As a rapidly growing area of the state, the pressures from many different user types and people in general necessitate this 50 yard setback, without it the consequences to people and their pets are too great. For example, I recently had one friend whose dog was caught in a snare (around its neck) on the Moose Range Trails, near Murphy Road. The trapline was less than 2 ski pole lengths from the popular cross-country ski trail. Increase setbacks are critically needed.

Again, I support Proposal 199 and 50-yard trap setbacks for multi-use trails in the Mat-Su area. This is a reasonable rule for all users of the trails and will help to prevent accidental harm or deaths to pets.

Thanks in advance for your consideration.



Submitted By
Dave Winney
Submitted On
2/17/2022 12:05:28 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907-255-4736
Email
winney@cvinternet.net
Address
P.O. Box 1063
Valdez, Alaska 99686

Proposal 116

I support

Before the crossbow certification class was required hunters were able to hunt during the rifle season.

Now that a crossbow certification is required, if you don't live in Anchorage or Fairbanks is a hardship.

A archery instructor isn't qualified. A two to three day trip is needed to finish the course.

Proposal 121.

Opposition.

I wouldn't like to see the use of dogs to be allowed to hunt big game. What is stopping them from going on private property.

Proposal 127.

Support.

SCI record book has a airgun category, easy on the ears, modern day rifle and handgun ammunition is expensive and hard to find.

Proposal 130.

Opposition.

I would like to see synthetic urine used but not real urine.

They make biodegradable, non-toxic, artificial urine that will not be harmful to Alaska's wildlife.

Proposal 232.

Opposition.

I don't like the thought of the dogs going on private property.

They could get in traps and snares.

Proposal 239.

Opposition.

If this is passed it will eliminate some hunts. It works based on effort and not luck. Lots of villages have their own ordinances. A hunter who goes to stand in line is better educated on what the locals want to see from the hunt. Dictionary permit authority is really important. It is the only way to have sustained hunt opportunities. If 239 is passed, how will it work for the online permits?



Submitted By
Ron Yuen
Submitted On
2/15/2022 7:32:02 AM
Affiliation

Phone
808-227-4166
Email
ronyuen@hawaii.rr.com

Address
95-982 Wikao St.
APT L301
Mililani, Hawaii 96789-5060

I am a local cat TNR participant in Mililani, Hawaii and I want you to know that I am in support for Proposal 144 and for TNVR programs. Please support Proposal 144 and please exempt sterilized community cats from the list of species prohibited from being released into the wild. TNVR programs are good for cats and good for all communities no matter where you live. Aloha!



Submitted By

Alissa Zank

Submitted On

2/18/2022 4:17:00 PM

Affiliation

Phone

9075218202

Email

smile_alissa@hotmail.com

Address

PO BOX 644

WILLOW, Alaska 99688

I do not support Proposal 199 proposing trapping setbacks from trails. Trappers should not be forced off of trails many of which are in existence because of trappers because those that recreate can't be responsible pet owners and don't keep their pets leashed or under control. I have dogs myself and I trap. I don't allow my dogs to go on public trails unleashed for many reasons including possible traps, other people, other wildlife, etc. Who decides what constitutes a "popular" trail? This overreach that is unwarranted. I do not support proposal 199. Thank you



Submitted By
Stefan Zijlstra
Submitted On
2/16/2022 4:05:56 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9076777473
Email
zijlstra@yahoo.com

Address
13910 Venus Way
Anchorage, Alaska 99515

I would like to comment on proposal 199, regarding a proposed 50-yard trap setbacks from popular multi-use trails in the MatSu region. I am STRONGLY in favor of this proposal. There is absolute zero need or logical reason for traps being set close to trails that are seeing heavy traffic by other user groups. These traps constitute a significant danger to dogs and/or humans and should be set back at least 50 yards, if not more, or made entirely illegal in areas that see a large number of walkers, bikers, or skiers in the winter. Therefore, I urge you to pass proposal 199. I would also ask you to consider this trapping setback of 50 yards from popular trails statewide, not only in the MatSu region.

Thanks!

Stefan Zijlstra