



PC101

Submitted by: Steven Pinedo

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Roseville, ca

Comment:

I oppose the implementation of prop73 limiting non resident hunters to one deer on Kodiak Island because ADF&G opposes the change as there is no biological reason for it and winter kill is the controlling factor for the deer population, not non resident harvest.



PC102

Submitted by: Vince Pokryfki

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Wasilla

Comment:

I am for the immediate implementation of suspending non residents from hunting Sheep in Alaska until our populations are such that it can carry guided hunts without impact to sheep numbers in any GMU.



PC103

Submitted by: Zach Porter

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Nikiski, Ak.

Comment:

I am writing in disagreement to proposal 73. This proposal will be damaging to local businesses and, after watching comments made by the ADF&G, I believe it was made using incorrect information. From ADF&G testimony and my own 23 years of experience on Kodiak, the deer population has not been reduced significantly by recent winter kill or non-resident hunting. Thank you for your time and consideration.



PC104

Submitted by: Benjamin Potter

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: California

Comment:

I have had the privilege of hunting Kodiak for several years now and have always been amazed by the island and its incredible hunting opportunity. From this experience I have been able to share and turn on a few dozen other hunters to the deer hunting in Kodiak. Being from CA this venture up to the great island of Kodiak is no small task and with the recent proposed changes it is hard to justify the expense, especially in this economy, to fly all that way for one deer.

It's hard to understand this rule change for non-residents with the deer populations healthy and the negative impact this would have on the locals on Kodiak that depend on these hunting opportunities for their community and livelihood.

From my perspective and situation, it will be hard for me and my fellow hunters to continue to justify hunting deer in Kodiak if this was to move forward.

I ask that you would consider all the variables this deer harvest limit would affect inside the state and outside before moving forward.

Thank you for your time.



PC105

Submitted by: Jeffery Pralle

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Wasilla, AK

Comment:

Members of the board,

I would like to applaud the members that called this meeting in order to address the nonresident Dall sheep season closure in 19 C.

The proposal for a closing for the season on dall sheep in 19 C was opposed by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game as stated by our professional biologist.

The initial proposal was presented as a resource issue. With the proposal aimed at protecting the resource. During the course of deliberation it was changed to an allocation proposal. Which in the end did not even favor the local residents that live on the north and northwest side of the Alaska range.

This proposal if allowed to stand does grievous harm to many Alaskan's livelihood that provide commercial services to nonresident hunters.

It has been proven that full curl, 8 years of age or both horns broken regulations are sufficient for maintaining or sheep herd. As a nearly lifelong Alaskan first moving here in 1975 and spending a large portion of the year in 19 C over the last

30 years I oppose this proposal and would strongly urge that it be delayed. This will allow additional research before it is addressed during the 2024 interior Board of game meeting.

Sincerely,

Jeffory Pralle

Wasilla, Alaska

May 14, 2023



PC106

Submitted by: Vincent Ranieri

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: West Islip, New York

Comment:

Vincent Ranieri

Please do not change the deer hunting regulations in unit 8. Based on the research I have done the deer population is healthy and the current hunting regulations maintain the current population and there is no reason to change the regulations in place. I am a non resident hunter and would like to continue hunting in unit 8 under the current regulations.



unapologetically **FOR ALASKAN RESIDENTS**

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

May 17, 2023

Comments to Alaska Board of Game

Special Non-Regulatory Meeting May 25, 2023

Dear Chairman Burnett and members of the board,

Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK) strongly **opposes** a process and outcome whereby the board will potentially generate a proposal at a special non-regulatory meeting on May 25th that would then be heard at another special regulatory meeting that would change actions taken at the March Region II meeting in Soldotna and delay implementation of a nonresident sheep hunting closure for five years in Unit 19C

Process: Should the Board of Game get a "Do-Over"?

At the March 2023 Region II Board of Game meeting in Soldotna, the board voted on amended board-generated proposal 204 to close all nonresident sheep hunting in Unit 19C for five years, based on conservation concerns for a severely declining sheep population.

The board well understood the implications and negative effects this sheep hunting closure would have on guides and their clients who had already booked sheep hunts for 2023. Guides strongly expressed those very concerns during public testimony. The board then took those concerns into account during long and sometimes passionate deliberations and voted to take the action they did based on the majority sharing conservation concerns for a severely declining sheep population and the belief that we could not wait until 2024 to impose restrictions on nonresident sheep hunters who were taking nearly all the harvest.

Board members who voted for the 5-year nonresident sheep hunting closure in Unit 19C were lobbied after the vote to bring it back up at the end of the meeting for reconsideration and change their vote, but it was not brought up for reconsideration.



Now, two members of the board who may have disagreed with the outcome of amended proposal 204 have called a special non-regulatory meeting to introduce a board-generated proposal to delay implementation of the sheep hunting closure to nonresidents in Unit 19C. With the hopes we assume that at least one of the members who voted yes on amended proposal 204 in March will now change their mind.

Is this the future of our Board of Game, where the board makes an informed decision at a regulatory meeting, and then members who are later pressured or didn't agree with the vote want a do-over? Is this how the board and the public process should function?

Board-Generated Proposals are Supposed to be a Last Resort

Board-generated proposals are to be avoided by the board absent new and urgent information that requires the board to take the initiative. Board-generated proposal 204 is a perfect example of the board misusing the public process; RHAK and members of the public have been submitting proposals for every Region III cycle (as well as Agenda Change Requests) to limit nonresident sheep hunters in Unit 19C based on sheep conservation concerns, and guides have been proposing a complete sheep hunting closure for everyone. There was nothing new or urgent that has not already been addressed by the public that would cause the board to generate and submit proposal 204 to be heard out of cycle and out of region.

Another board-generated proposal for a do-over on a past vote that would delay implementation of a closure they felt in March was absolutely necessary is the same misuse of the public process. There is nothing new or urgent that has come about since the March meeting in Soldotna that would cause the board to generate their own proposal to change how they voted. The information they have now is the same information they had in March.

Public Process of Wildlife Management wil be Degraded

If yet another board-generated proposal isn't problematic enough, should the board vote to introduce a board-generated proposal to delay implementation of the nonresident sheep hunting closure in Unit 19C, that proposal would have to be public noticed for a regulatory meeting and be heard before the new regulations go into effect, leaving little opportunity for the public process to work the way it is supposed to. Advisory Committees are on break until fall and board support staff are on leave. The broader public has moved on to their long-awaited summer plans, and even if some



could change plans there will be no public testimony allowed at any future special regulatory meeting according to Board Support. Only written comments will be allowed.

There is also the issue of a new board appointee, Dave Lorrington, who will replace Lynn Keogh on July 1st. If a special regulatory meeting takes place after July 1, that puts Mr. Lorrington in a position to change the vote and outcome on something he was not a part of in March.

All of this is not how our praised public process of wildlife management is supposed to work.

Background on Proposal 204 – Subversion of Public Process

The board generated proposal 204 to completely close all sheep hunting for five years in Unit 19C during the Board of Game November 2022 Agenda Change Request (ACR) meeting. Prior to that, at that same meeting, the board declined to accept RHAK ACR 12¹, which asked for limits on nonresident sheep hunters in Unit 19C based on conservation concerns for the declining sheep population. The board voted unanimously not to accept RHAK ACR 12 to be heard at the 2023 Region II meeting in Soldotna based on the premise that there were no valid conservation concerns for the Unit 19C sheep population. RHAK ACR 12, according to all seven members of the board, did not identify a “biological concern for the population” and thus did not meet the criteria for acceptance.

Shortly after that vote, at the same ACR meeting, the board voted 6-1 in favor of what would become board-generated proposal 204 to completely close Unit 19C to all sheep hunting for five years based on the same conservation concerns for the sheep population that RHAK had brought up with ACR 12. Somehow, after saying there were no valid conservation concerns for Unit 19C sheep, six members of the board minutes later reversed themselves and identified the same biological concern for the sheep population that was supposed to require them to accept RHAK ACR 12 and have it before the public at the March 2023 Region II meeting.

What the board overtly did was subvert the public process and ensure that only one option would be on the table regarding sheep conservation and changes to sheep hunting in Unit 19C in 2023 – their preferred option for a complete sheep hunting closure for everyone for five years. And that sole option before the public led the board down a path that led to a complete

¹ <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/gameboard/pdfs/2022-2023/acr/acr12-2022.pdf>



sheep hunting closure for nonresidents for five years starting this 2023 season that is being widely opposed by guides and their clients to the point the board now wants a do-over via another board-generated proposal out of cycle.

**Is the Board Really Okay with Nonresidents
Taking 90% or more of the Sheep Harvest in 2023
from a Severely Declined Population?**

Again, the board took the action they did in March based on the premise that the sheep population in Unit 19C could not handle any more nonresident hunting. If the board gets a do-over and votes to delay implementation of the closure for nonresident sheep hunters, we will see the same (or more) impacts and harvests by nonresidents as we did in 2022.

In Closing

We strongly oppose the approval of any board-generated proposal to change the outcome of board actions taken at the Region II March 2023 meeting and delay implementation of the nonresident sheep hunting closure in Unit 19C.

Nothing has changed since the March meeting for the board to now want to reconsider how the board voted on amended proposal 204. Pushing for reconsideration to delay implementation via another board-generated proposal that will be heard out of cycle during the summer months only further subverts the public process and disenfranchises the public.

We urge the board to vote down another board-generated proposal to reverse the informed vote and outcome of amended proposal 204 at the March 2023 Region II meeting.

Respectfully,

Mark Richards

Executive Director Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)



PC108

Submitted by: Ethan Rogers

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Arkansas

Comment:

It has always been a dream of mine to come to Alaska and hunt Sitka Black-Tailed deer on Kodiak Island. Over the past few years I have saved and budgeted and was finally able to book my trip of lifetime for fall of 2023 out of Larsen Bay. Then in March I received word that the bag limit for nonresidents on deer in this area was reduced from 3 to 1, and from the research I have done, it appears this decision was made without any scientific backing and the deer population is thriving and as healthy as ever. My family and I love to eat venison and I had planned on harvesting two deer to get the full experience of the trip, have enough meat to justify the expense, and share with my family. My hunting partner and I are now cancelling the trip, but if the limit was increased to at least 2 deer, we would keep the scheduled trip and I'm sure have a once in a lifetime trip. I urge the Board to please reconsider their decision. Thank you



PC109

Submitted by: Donald Ruhoff

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Willow,alaska

Comment:

So what's different from the March meeting. Did they find all the missing sheep. Do what's right. Listen to your biologist and protect the wildlife for the residents hunters of Alaska. Thanks.



PC110

Submitted by: Michael Schubach

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Mill Hall PA

Comment:

I understand that ADF&G is considering reducing the non-resident bag limit on deer from 3 to 1 in Unit 8 effective July 1. I am against this proposal. Non-residents are an important source of revenue for many businesses in the Alaska and Kodiak areas, including Alaska DF&G. There are plentiful deer in this area. I am asking you keep the bag limit unchanged for non-residents.



Submitted by: Sage Shepherd

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Coeur d'Alene

Comment:

Hello, I am a 20 year old resident of Idaho. Last year by some stroke of luck I was able to hunt on Kodiak island for blacktail deer. For me it was a life changing experience and one of the most epic things I have ever been able to be a part of. So when I got the opportunity to go again this year I jumped on it, booked my tickets and applied for my time off. Since then I have been counting down the days till I my flight takes off and I get to relive that experience again. Until today when my buddy called me and informed me of the regulation change of one deer. Limiting hunters to one deer makes it very hard to justify the financial burden, as well as the time off it takes to make the journey and participate in the hunt worth while. This will drastically change our plans for this hunt and completely change the experience for the both of us. Without any warning to the regulation change before we booked the trip we are stuck now with No other option except to ask you to reconsider your decision for the 2023 season so at least we will be able to have different expectations when we are plan to book in the future.



Submitted by: Carl Sholl

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

I am writing in in concern for the changing of the limit of non resident deer tags. I'm a lifelong Kodiak resident that was born and raised here. I've been witness to many seasons, coming and going many harsh winters. Growing up here being raised on an outdoor lifestyle where subsistence was a major part of life. I've spent many falls in the hills, chasing deer, elk, bear and goat. Over the years, I've seen plenty of non-resident and resident hunters alike come to our beautiful island to share in the experience. In more recent years with the advent of social media and hunting becoming so popular again that number has spiked and with that number, spiking the number of outside transporters and other guide services having the gold rush affect has also spiked. In just the last five years, I've watched the number of transporters almost quadruple a few of them being my friends that run those boats and I get their business decisions, putting food on their families tables. that being said I have seen plenty of the game that has been taken off this island Being given away or trying to find people to take the meat due to the hunters, just wanting to keep their trophies and not take care or pay for the freight to bring the meat home. With the influx of out of town transporters, the city of Kodiak doesn't see much of any of the revenue pulled in from the influx of hunters. Granted, due to weather, some of the hotels stay quite booked through a fair amount of the fall, but like most other families living around here and being a commercial fisherman when I get time away from the boat to go and do my hunting late in the fall early winter and the transporters are in full swing with 3 to 5 boats per bay and five guys on each boat. It makes things quite difficult when you come around the Cape and can start spotting rafts pulled up on almost every beach in a bay with guys on the hillside. And in all my years of hunting in Kodiak Island with last year being a semi-mild winter by the time I was able to start hunting in November, I have never seen the deer population so slim and in some of the best areas I've ever hunted and not only with the added pressure on the deer population, these hunters and transporters are also setting subsistence crab pots to get crab for dinners and shooting every

fox They see plus multiple species of ducks so there is added pressure on them as well. Even though the biologist have said, winters are the major effect on the deer population. It's only a matter of time before harsh winters and springs like we had this year with winter kill off and the hunting pressure combine takes it ultimate toll on our deer population. I believe the tag reduction from 3 to 1 was a good call by the board of game as preventative measures before a future collapse in our deer population and the reduction of tags for residences that ultimately depend on the meat. Thank you for your time.



PC113

Submitted by: Ben Simonds

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage,AK

Comment:

I believe that as a state our first responsibility is to its citizens. Often those coming from outside are swiftly moved from transportation hub and out to their location of hunting. I understand the income it provides for those guides. However, if we do not protect our population long term then even the residents are not going to be able to enjoy our resources. Many of which in this case put food on our table. I encourage you to support limiting hunting in these two units for the prescribed and discussed period of time.

Thank you.



PC114

Submitted by: Tucker Souther

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Brevard, NC

Comment:

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in regards to the proposed regulations concerning the nonresident deer bag limit in Unit 8. I will be traveling to Alaska to hunt in unit 8 this fall, part of the appeal for this particular hunt was the opportunity to take more than one deer as the members of my group all feed their families almost exclusively with wild game meat. We all plan on taking every scrap of meat that we harvest home with us, even though it is expensive to do so I feel that it is worth the expense for the quality of meat that we are able to acquire compared to buying commercially grown meat at the grocery store.

I would like to state that I fully support properly managing a population of game animals and if hunting is placing to great a strain on a population then by all means limit opportunity to help preserve the resource, however if I understand correctly this regulation change was not made to help a population of animals in decline. I strongly believe that the ultimate authority on wildlife regulations should be the biologists who have been educated and trained to determine the health of a population and implement a system that allows for sustainably harvesting surplus animals in a manner that will

not effect the population into the future. Until a biological need has been identified then I urge you to reconsider implementing these regulations at this time.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tucker Souther



PC115

Submitted by: Elijah Stewart

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Crofton, Ky

Comment:

As some one who has hunted deer their whole and and hunted Unit 8 some, I think that such a drastic limit change from 3 down to 1 will not only deter non residents like myself from wanting to come back, but will also allow for places that do not see much human traffic to become over populated. Thus cutting back on the amount of revenue generated, as well as making the deer herd susceptible to disease and starvation. I am not in favor of the 1 deer bag limit.



PC116

Submitted by: Brian Stoltz

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Fairbanks, AK

Comment:

Should a closure be warranted, please limit non-resident interests via draw or restriction before you limit resident harvest.



PC117

Submitted by: Tyler Stortz

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, AK

Comment:

Nonresident deer bag limits

Closure of 19C dall sheep hunting to nonresidents

I am in full support of both measures. It is about time that Alaska start making decisions based on sound biology as well as in favor of those of us that call Alaska our home. For to long the outfitters/transporters have ruled the high seas and the mountains exploiting Alaska's resources in the name of non resident money. Gone are the days of going to Kodiak and not seeing transporters in many of the bays for months on end taking massive amounts of deer. With antlers and hides going home and much of the meat never going with them.

As far as the sheep are concerned I truly believe more regulation is needed for nonresident hunters and outfitters. They act like they own the resource and they have the run of the place. Not to mention sub legal animals being taken by supposed "professionals".

In summary I support both measures!



PC118

Submitted by: Greg Svendsen

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage AK.

Comment:

I don't think you should delay the sheep closure in 19C as the sheep numbers are down and the non-resident are taking 90% of the sheep. Other states give residents preference when game numbers are low. Why don't we do the same in this case.

As far as Kodiak deer these populations can change drastically each year so they aren't as likely to stay down for a long period of time like sheep.



Taiga Resources Conservation

PO Box 378 Klawock, Alaska USA 99925

Phone: 1.907.320.0228

Email: bobbyfithian@cvinternet.net

a management and consulting firm specializing in conservation based natural resource industry support. We provide industry, governmental, regional, and community assistance in understanding, developing, and maintaining conservation based initiatives that will help sustain long term stewardship for important social/cultural atmospheres, fish, wildlife, land/water habitats, and industry developments within them.



PC119

May 20, 2023

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
PO Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Board of Game Objection and Action Request, Proposal 204, Closing Non-Resident Dall's Sheep Hunting in GMU 19C.

Dear Chairman Burnett and Board of Game (BOG) Members,

These comments are coming from a tenured professional guide and conservationist who has extensive knowledge of GMU 19C Dall's sheep.

It is my hope that these comments will help you decide to reinstate the GMU 19C nonresident hunting season for 2023 and look forward to a thorough addressment of Dall's sheep management strategy during the 2024 Interior Region BOG Meeting.

Relative to Proposal 204 as passed, ADF&G Wildlife Conservation staff provided the BOG solid data that Dall's sheep management by full curl guidelines works. The BOG chose to differ from known and proven science by eliminating nonresident allocation within GMU 19C.

Dall's sheep management in Alaska has been successfully conducted for several decades by utilizing the "Full Curl" concept of management which recognizes that harvest of the older age class of rams does not impact overall sheep population trends. This is a long time proven scientific basis.

By deviating from proven, scientific management guidelines, we have paved the way for utilization of non-science-based action to base similar hunter restriction or elimination efforts within both State and Federal wildlife management arenas.



Elimination of allocation without proven science and ignoring proven science to take away from peoples livelihoods generates unneeded disrespect for the BOG process. How can any professional guide service provider try to build viability and sustainability within a conservation based operating basis, not live in fear of these type of BOG actions. This type of action generates unneeded disrespect for the process.

The BOG is required to conduct a cost analysis of the impact of what passing a proposal may have on the public. There was no communication within that analysis for proposal 204 about the substantial financial impact on the professional guides who have hunts booked for 19C, or the local businesses who support them.

BOG decisions turning away from Dall's sheep full curl management may well lead to similar requests relative to moose management by antler restrictions.

If it is not broken, don't fix it. Do not open Pandora's Box of curses. Full curl management and antler restrictions work.

BOG action taking away nonresident hunter allocation, will not affect the Dall's sheep population trend within GMU 19C.

Please know that I have personally witnessed sheep populations within 19C go through the exact same population trend as we are experiencing today, and, watched them come back without severely restricted or elimination of hunting opportunity.

During the 1990's when we had several years of similar hard winters, our predator control had been lost due to recent ballot initiatives, the guide area system had been struck down by the courts, there was no license and control board, and we went from licensing 4-7 new guides per year to over 100. State of Alaska lands were the target for this large number of newly licensed guide and as an example, he small area which I guide within went from 3 guides to 14.

Still, the sheep came back, due directly to full curl management and not emotionally driven hunting elimination or restrictions.

If proposal 204 had not passed, professional guides would have a few hunters this fall according to viable opportunity, the dreams of their clients would be intact, local businesses would have continued to have revenue, resident hunters would have opportunity and all of us should have turned together in 2024 to focus on initiatives that would actually help our wild sheep.

As passed, the BOG will now have to address on a statewide basis, proposals utilizing this recent action as a basis and requesting elimination of one user group over another based on emotion and not science.

Proposal 204 was an out of cycle BOG proposal, generated through the Agenda Change Request process which required addressment prior to the scheduled spring 2024 Interior Region cycle. The 2024 Interior Region Meeting is where deliberation of the 19C Dall's sheep concern should occur. Please know that I have submitted proposals for that cycle relative to this concern.

Within that proper venue, we can all turn together to address initiative to help the Dall's sheep in GMU



19C and, can quite possibly design/generate a model to address similar concerns in other parts of the state.

It is important to the integrity of the BOG process that we turn together to address these types of concerns. As passed as an out of cycle proposal, complete elimination of non-resident opportunity and not even providing a respectful opportunity to discuss initiatives that could help the sheep population, 204 negatively impacted professional guide industry service providers who will now be less likely to respect or believe in the BOG process.

Please know that you will find no person who cares more for Alaska's wild sheep than I do. They represent an indelible treasure to our State as a whole and I have been very fortunate to have spent as many years as I have enjoying life while living with our Dall's sheep.

Several of us have hunts booked by clients who have long dreamed about their upcoming opportunity. We know the sheep population and harvest potential as well as anyone and restrict our bookings accordingly. Proposal 204 as passed took livelihood away from us and at the same time provided unlimited opportunity for resident hunters.

This is not right, it divides Alaska, and it needs respectful reconsideration.

By supporting reconsideration and maintaining the Dall's sheep season hunting season as it has been for many years, Alaskan's like myself who strive to be good stewards and who work hard to create and maintain conservation based economic viability for our state, know that we are respected instead of under attack.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert R. Fithian".

Robert R. Fithian



PC120

Submitted by: Dustin Tallman

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Wasilla, AK

Comment:

Please do not delay the implementation of these proposals.

Reduction of nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder from three to one buck (Proposal 73); and

Closure of the nonresident, sheep hunt in Unit 19C (Proposal 204).

Thanks,

Dustin Tallman



PC121

Submitted by: Chase Thomas

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Fresno, CA

Comment:

My name is Chase Thomas. In 2020, we had two groups of six people that went on a seven day Sitka deer hunt in Unit 8. It was such a great experience that we are planning on going again in 2024. The memories and time we are able to spend as a family is what makes the trip. What makes Alaska so appealing, besides being in Alaska, is that it's one of the only places you can get a big group and everyone has a tag / tags. But with the new tag limit change of one tag instead of 3 tags has put a halt on if we are going to go in 2024.

On our last trip each person spent on average \$8,000 in Alaska between the tags, charter boat fees, hotels, flights, bush plane, clothes, restaurants, alcohol. This could potentially be a big revenue loss for Alaska.

It is my understanding that AK biologists and department officials do not support this move. Cutting tags will also not have any impact on the herd populations. From what I have heard the herds are thriving right now and only the winter weather could hurt these herds.

I hope you reconsider changing the tag limits back to three deer and my family will have more great memories in 2024.

Thank you,

Chase Thomas



PC122

Submitted by: Alexandria Troxell

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

I was born and raised on Kodiak island, I am an Alutiiq from the village of Old Harbor. Every year my family hunts for deer near Old Harbor. In the past 10 years the amount of hunting pressure from outside outfitters has decimated the deer populations near my home village. Large charter type boats are docking in the village and rotating new clients weekly. 12 people per trip times 3 deer each adds up very quickly. It is heartbreaking to take my children out to fill out freezers only to find very few small deer remaining.

Please do something to help save this important resource.



PC123

Submitted by: Ben Truitt

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak alaska

Comment:

I don't think it would be a bad idea to try it for at least 2 years. There is a lot of hunting pressure in remote areas all over the island making it harder for the people that live here for the freedom to hunt and subsist. Also most of these people don't practice hunter etiquette like locals do. If the economy is an issue losing one Kodiak resident would be a lot worse for the economy than losing 50 hunters. I think people will still come after their big buck it'll just make them choose wisely before taking that shot. Meat is the #1 priority and a lot of people don't bring it home because shipping it can be a pain.



PC124

Submitted by: Joseph von Benedikt

Organization Name: Outdoor Writer, Podcast Host

Community of Residence: Preston, Idaho

Comment:

To whom it may concern:

I write to formally request that you overturn the recent regulation limiting non-resident hunters to harvesting just one Sitka Blacktail deer on Kodiak Island.

Please allow at least two deer per hunter, and preferably the traditional three deer per hunter.

This is a time-honored destination hunt and species that blue-collar non-resident hunters can afford, and the "one deer" regulation significantly reduces the quality of the experience and the amount of meat such hunters can take home.

Thank you,

Joseph von Benedikt

Western Editor, Petersen's Hunting

Host, Backcountry Hunting Podcast



PC125

Submitted by: Robert Vorwaller

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Elko, Nevada

Comment:

I oppose the implementation of prop.

I booked a blacktail deer hunt for 2023 two years in advance. A big draw for this hunt is the option to harvest more than one deer if given the opportunity. If you harvest early it feels like your trip isn't over even if you do not harvest another animal. After doing some research and based on a previous hunt I only harvested one animal and many nonresident hunters only harvest one animal. Nonresident hunters have minimal impact on the deer population and I also understand there is no biological need for this measure.



PC126

Submitted by: Lawrence Walker

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Howard, pa.

Comment:

I have hunted unit 8 several times and have seen 40 to 60 deer a day don't think you need to change number of harvest. I think it would be very hard for an older gentleman like myself to pack out a deer with the meat still on the bone. I still love to climb the mountains and hike 2 or 3 miles back. The Alaska adventure wouldn't be same if a had to hunt next to the shore line.



PC127

Submitted by: Chris Wallstrum

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Willow

Comment:

Limiting nonresidents in unit 8 and 19c needs to be continued for the health of the limited resource base and animal population. Transporters and guides are putting so much pressure on these limited resources for the sake of money and the quality of hunts and the individual populations are declining. Let's restrict first and we err on the side of caution to see how the trend continues. Historically we wait until it is too late before action. Please keep the restrictions in place for the sake of the resource and the health of the state. Thank you.



PC128

Submitted by: Dusty Wheeler

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Mountain Home, AR

Comment:

I never seen another hunter in 7 days and seen over 100 deer a day, no need to cut tags in areas where the numbers are good, it was cut do to the residents complaining about nonresident killing all the deer witch it stupid, the residents kill all of the easy access deer and think that the nonresident are to blame



PC129

Submitted by: Matthew White

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cedar City, Utah

Comment:

There is no biological evidence for this deer reduction.



PC130

Submitted by: Aimee Williams

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

Good day and thanks for the opportunity to comment on delaying this proposal. Given the steep increase in transporter type businesses who bring non-resident hunters directly to areas around the island to harvest and then leave without any addition to the Kodiak region economy, I am strongly against the delay of this proposal. Non resident hunters do play an important part in making a diverse revenue stream when they come to Kodiak, stay overnight, are assisted by guides, and are transported by Kodiak based businesses. The scales are much more level when there are resources put into the economy and resources taken out. When transporters come in and anchor and then just take resources out, there is only loss to the region with no other source of balance. It is important to take into consideration how many Kodiak region residents actually use the Sitka deer population as a part of their family's subsistence lifestyle. Deer are much more than an exciting hunt on a remote island. Deer are a foundational food source for locals. I applaud you for taking the steps to limit the deer harvest to one for non-residents. I appreciate your forward thinking and your care of those who live in the Kodiak Region. I urge you to follow through and place the limit as soon as possible.



PC131

Submitted by: Catherine Williamson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Las Vegas, Nevada

Comment:

As a non resident hunter this has been very disappointing that we are now only allowed one deer tag a year. I have bought tags and my license every year for the past 3 years and this has been a ritual of mine to come to Kodiak and shoot two three deer. We pay for each tag but now we are being told only one a year. I am very disappointed and this will only have a negative affect on business and other hunters that make their way to Alaska every year.



PC132

Submitted by: Joel Wilson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Arroyo grande, CA

Comment:

I am not in favor of the reduction in tags for the Kodiak nonresident deer season.

We will be hunting this upcoming season with my dad and brother.

Half the reason we are doing this hunt is because of the previous quota limits.

We booked this hunt a couple years ago to get the better season dates on our charter.

I will most likely not return if this limit stays to 1 deer.

Please reconsider

Thank you



PC133

Submitted by: Daniel Wilson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Arroyo Grande, CA

Comment:

Hello,

Myself and seven of my close friends are traveling to Kodiak in November for a week long deer hunt, this is the second time we have made this trip and it has been booked for several years. On this hunt we had planned to target taking a maximum two deer per hunter which is a big attraction to such an expensive trip as it makes for a full week of hunting and because we value being able to take the game meet home to our families as much as any hunter, resident or non-resident.

During this trip we all contribute to the local economy and we all value such an experience. Limiting non-residents to only one deer will make such an expensive trip feel hard to justify. Given the limited biological evidence to support the change in harvest limit and the difference between resident vs non-resident I would ask you please either 1) reconsider this change, 2) delay the change so hunters who have non-refundable trips are not impacted, or 3) make both resident and non-resident the same harvest limit of two deer per person.

Thank you,

Daniel Wilson



PC134

Submitted by: Jake Y

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Helenville WI

Comment:

I don't think the bag limit should change for non res. We pay higher tag fees to hunt the same as residents as well as travel and staying in your state. I feel like if you limit the amount of tags for non res there will be less desired for non residents to travel up to hunt.



PC135

Submitted by: Stig Yngve

Organization Name: Alaskan Born and Raised

Community of Residence: Kodiak, AK

Comment:

Regarding a reduced bag limit in UNIT 8 for Sitka Blacktail is what I am addressing. I am the author of this proposal with the backing of the Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee. There are transporters on our local Kodiak ADVISORY COMMITTEE and they supported this proposal unanimously. I had originally pushed for a reduced bag limit for RESIDENTS and NON-RESIDENTS alike on this proposal. That has failed to be mentioned in the progression of this proposal. I wanted a resident limit of 2 deer and 1 for nonresidents in UNIT 8. Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game and some hunters, nonresident and transporters especially, say there is no biological concern for a lack of deer. I beg to differ. There is such concentrated and localized harvest of deer around the coastal perimeter of Kodiak Island, there is no single part of the island within 2 miles of the coast that is not lacking in lifeforms, especially deer. It is a matter of biological concern, with 3 out of the last 4 winters being extremely harsh and knocking back the deer population. There are very few spikes and young does, a complete generation gap, and not very many deer over 3 years old, buck or doe. It has gotten to the point where it is difficult to obtain deer simply for consumption as a matter of local subsistence living for Kodiak Island residents in these areas. It can be chiefly attributed to Transporters running TOO MANY NONRESIDENT and RESIDENT hunters and harvesting too many deer in years following harsh winters. This is evidenced quite openly and blatantly by ADFG harvest statistics illustrating an upwarding and exponentially trending harvest of transporter and do it yourself nonresident deer harvest in recent years. Fish and Game and the USFWS DO NOT have adequate resources to truly see how few deer there are island wide, there is no true survey for deer every year. And some areas are much much worse than others. Non residents and transporters are crying the blues, but their track record of wanton waste and questionable harvest ethics undermines a desire for an increased bag limit. The only problem I see hear is a loss of bookings and cancellations for 2023 transporters because of a spur of the moment deer bag limit reduction in 2023 when folks already have a trip booked up. Tough. Tough for us and tough for nonresidents. Please don't backpedal on this issue. Stand firm in your decision Board of Game

I ask for no change whatsoever in the decision of the Board of Game.

Stig Yngve



Submitted by: Frank Zaldivar

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Fairbanks Alaska

Comment:

I strongly agree with RHAK and the previous decision that unit 19C sheep either be closed for 5 years to everyone or 5 years for non residents. The money lost by nonresidents and the money lost by outfitters and guides doesn't outweigh the importance of keeping healthy sheep populations in Alaska for Alaskans. Also unit 8 deer. I believe it should be limited by non residents. Second I had emailed a popular transporter on Kodiak (unit 8) and asked about the 1 tag limit for non residents and he was pleased to inform me that Alaska fish and game had emailed him that there was going to be a meeting on may 25th and that they were going to postpone the 1 deer rule till 2024 because they had failed to look at the monetary effect it would have. Why is ak fish and game telling transporters this in email when it was already voted on and passed. Plus this meeting has no regulatory authority. I believe that the voice of residents and the voice of RHAK should be heard and should hold more weight than non resident guides or non resident hunters or non resident outfitters.
