



Submitted By
Benjamin Rich
Submitted On
2/18/2022 5:43:09 PM
Affiliation

Proposal 101 – Oppose

I oppose proposal 101 because admitting crossbows into archery seasons would increase success rates and compromise archery hunts as a low impact way to increase hunting opportunity with minimal effects on game populations. Crossbows are much easier to use, and have much a further range then conventional archery tackle which could increase harvest rates and compromise the few dedicated archery hunts that currently exist in Alaska.

Proposal 123- Oppose

I oppose proposal 123 on the grounds that this technology has the potential to increase the efficacy of archery hunters to an extent where it is no longer a low impact use with low success rates. Modern compound technology is already allowing some well-practiced individuals to shoot accurately at ranges out to 100 yards. This technology will help archers to feel confident taking these exceptionally long shots in the field which can lead in higher then expected success rates if the shot is good, or marginal hits and wounding loss if it's not. The margin of error is much higher at longer ranges and I believe this technology will empower those using it to take marginal shots on game, instead of making cleaner kills with sure shots like Mr. Vanderbunt suggested. It also overturns the precedent of not allowing "optical enhancements" on bows and arrows in Alaska which could lead to legalization of more unnecessary technology in the future.

Proposal 124- Oppose

I oppose proposal 124 on the same grounds as proposal 123.

Proposal 126- Oppose

I oppose proposal 126 on the grounds that allowing scoped muzzleloaders in special muzzleloader only seasons and hunts would increase the efficacy of the weapon too much and could compromise public safety in many of the suburban situations where muzzleloader hunts occur. Modern inline muzzleloaders with sabot bullets are capable of shooting accurately to 300 + plus yards giving them similar efficacy to centerfire rifles. Scopes make users feel comfortable taking longer shots which could increase success rates. At longer distances hunters are also less likely to be attentive to what is behind their target and the potential trajectory of their projectile. The sponsor argues that the scopes allow hunters to make clean efficient kills and I agree. That's why I believe anyone who wants or needs the aid of a scope should hunt during general firearm seasons, and keep muzzleloader hunts as a close range, low impact management option for our wildlife.

Proposal 127 - Oppose

Air rifles and air bows are ineffective and unnecessary. Standard bows and centerfire rifles, and muzzleloaders/ shotguns have proven to have plenty of efficacy and fill the narrow niches that airbows and air rifles would fill. This regulation would also unnecessarily complicate regs and enforcement for the sake of a tiny demographic.

Proposals 135, 136, 137 – Oppose

I oppose proposals 135, 136, and 137 because the current restriction on flying to scout dall sheep during the season restricts aerial disruptions to sheep and other hunters, and partially mitigates the undeniable advantage of sheep hunters wealthy enough to own/access aircraft for sheep hunting.

Proposal 138 – Support

I support proposal 138 because I believe that extending this restriction to encompass the early youth season as well as any late hunts such as ds140 will further the benefits of restricting aircraft disruption of sheep and other hunters and will level the playing field even further between fly-in and walk-in hunters.

Proposal 139 – Oppose

I oppose proposal 139 because it effectively undermines the restriction on scouting flights and is hardly more enforceable then the original regulation.

Proposal 234 – Oppose

I oppose proposal 234 because it is not in line with fair chase principles. And will allow hunters to monitor their bait sites remotely.



Proposal 150 – Oppose

I oppose proposal 150 because it creates an arms race that makes draw permits increasingly inaccessible to lower income hunters. Nearly doubling the number of possible chances while keeping the cost per chance the same puts more strain on the average Alaskan hunter and favors those of means. This proposal may result in marginally higher profits for the state, but is akin to “point creep”, a well documented phenomenon in hunt draw systems in other states. Point creep is a drawing system progressively becoming more complex, competitive and expensive. Alaska has largely avoided this problem by limiting the number of chances possible as well as making every year’s results independent of the previous years. Continually ratcheting the number of available chances you can buy is a form of privatization of wildlife, as the most wealthy will be able to stack the odds in their favor.

Proposal 162 – Support

Snowshoe hare have intrinsic value and are great eating. Salvage of meat and or skin should be required to make sure these valuable animals are properly respected and are not wasted or killed without reason.

Proposal 235 – Oppose

Snowshoe hare provide plenty of hunting opportunity without spot lighting when they are abundant. Current regulations also allow their harvest by snares which provides a traditional and humane way to harvest them during the night without causing unnecessary disturbance.