

The following comments were submitted on-time but were inadvertently excluded from the RC workbook. (Incorrect comments are listed as PC120). Mr. Montgomery's comments will be included in the on-time AC and Public Comment matrix as RC029. Boards Support apologizes for the error.

Submitted By
Daniel Montgomery
Submitted On
2/18/2022 11:43:59 PM
Affiliation

RC029

Thank you Chairman Burnett and board members for this opportunity to comment on these statewide proposals. I'm really distressed at how late the ADFG were in getting there comments out for the public to see. As the deadline is only a few hours away they still don't have comments on some of these proposals. Department comments are very important for the public to have all the information they need to make informed decisions. Some of these proposals have been on the books for over 1 1/2 years. and 7 months minimum. I believe ADFG is required to have them out 60 days before the start of the meeting. Very disappointing.

I SUPPORT the following proposals: 123, 129, 130, 135, 136, 137, 139, 145, 149, 150, 154, 159, 161, 163, 164, 165, 193, 242 and 269.

Proposals 135, 136 and 137: These three proposals ask you to rescind the language in brackets that is known as proposal 207 that was put in place in 2015 at the region 2 meeting at UAA in Anchorage. 207 was a board generated proposal that was generated at the region 1 meeting in Southeast Alaska and was moved to the region 4 meeting in Wasilla in February of 2015 and then deferred to the Region 2 meeting at UAA in March of 2015. I sat through every day of both meetings and 207 was tabled until the last hour and a half of the last day at the region 2 meeting when there was almost nobody still at the meeting. Everybody assumed that the board was going to move it to the statewide meeting in Fairbanks in March of 2016 because it was a statewide proposal and they had tabled it earlier and deferred it two times already. That didn't happen. The board broke its own rules when it took up this proposal and passed it. 207 had three different proposals and what is in regulation now was proposal 1. Proposal 2 read: It is against the law to hunt or help someone else take a Dall sheep until 2 PM the day following the day you have flown. Proposal 3 read: It is against the law to hunt or help someone else take a dall sheep within 5 miles of the site where you were flown-in, until 24 (48) hours after you have flown. The public were 2 to 1 opposed to any new aircraft restrictions and to my recollection nobody supported the very restrictive language that is in regulation now. It was looked at as going way to far. By far the most recommended by people that wanted more restrictions was number 2 or a 24 hour wait period. The board broke its own rules when it made and took up this proposal. The public can't submit any proposal that proposes multiple things and choices because when you are addressing that proposal nobody knows what part you are referring too, one or all three. The public can't make a statewide proposal out of cycle unless there is a dire biological concern for a game population. When 207 was brought back up and voted on at the end of the meeting the board adjourned shortly after and the few of us that were still in the meeting never had a chance to ask some of the members to reconsider their votes. I think this was a planned strategy. If the board would have voted and passed this same thing two days earlier they would have had 500 angry people in the room the next day ready to tar and feather them. Nobody from the public had ever proposed anything this broad and restrictive, if anything at all. In my 15 years of attending these meetings I've never seen anything submitted before this was.. I ask this board to please pass one of these proposals and rescind these aircraft restrictions and if the public really wants it someone can resubmit this same language in the next cycle and this board can debate its merits without any biases.

Proposal 139. SUPPORT. I submitted this proposal and what it does is put the definition of harass in place of the current very restrictive language that is known as proposal 207. Current regulations state: You MAY NOT take any game by driving, herding, harassing or molesting game with any motorized vehicle such as an aircraft, airboat, snowmachine, motor-driven boat, etc. There is no definition for driving or herding or molesting but there is for harassing. Instead of guessing what the meaning of the above restrictions are and having to find it in the definitions this puts it front and center for everyone to see and understand it. Everyone has a video recorder with them now in their smart phone and it would be obvious if you were violating this rule. The definition of harass in the handy dandy is: HARASS - To repeatedly approach an animal in a manner which results in the animal altering its behavior. This spells out what you can and can't do with a aircraft or any motorized vehicle when approaching sheep or any animal.

I OPPOSE these proposals; 106, 117, 119, 121, 134, 138, 141, 144, 146, 147, 181, 153, 160, 166, 167, 168, 169, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 240, 241 and 267.