

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Dori Hollingsworth .....	PC001
Pere Davidson .....	PC002
Micah Miller .....	PC003
Jeffrey Davis .....	PC004
James M. McCann .....	PC005
Lisa Green.....	PC006
Theodore Bryant .....	PC007
Ken Green .....	PC008
Mike Chihuly .....	PC009
Penny Nixon.....	PC010
Maureen Peterson.....	PC011
Dorian Traylor .....	PC012
Nick Humphreys .....	PC013
Daryl Hollingsworth .....	PC014
Dennis Ackerman.....	PC015
Randy K. Rogers.....	PC016
Rod Berns.....	PC017
Chris Brehmer .....	PC018
David Ellision .....	PC019
Duncan Harrison .....	PC020
Jim Anderson .....	PC021
Russell Biggs .....	PC022

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Denise Abel.....	PC023
Theresa Bostwick.....	PC024
John Haddix .....	PC025
Barry Santana.....	PC026
Kate [Unkown].....	PC027
Janice Troyer.....	PC028
Jeff Schmitz .....	PC029
Mark Miraglia .....	PC030
MaryBeth Printz.....	PC031
W. Withrow.....	PC032
Stephan Hyams .....	PC033
Todd Smith.....	PC034
William Petrik.....	PC035
Andrea Lang.....	PC036
Dan Brandvold .....	PC037
Gail Boerwinkle .....	PC038
John M. Miller .....	PC039
John Rose.....	PC040
Jonathan Galin .....	PC041
Kyle Drasky .....	PC042
Jeremiah Prater.....	PC043
Marty and Annette Cordano.....	PC044

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Lance Raymore .....	PC045
Eric Lee .....	PC046
Madeleine Grant.....	PC047
Scott Breitsprecher.....	PC048
Andrew Scrivo .....	PC049
Warren Buck Brown .....	PC050
William Rice & Ann Williams .....	PC051
National Park Service .....	PC052
Denise Elder.....	PC053
USFWS Office of Subsistence Management.....	PC054
Donald Lietzau.....	PC055
Lance Kramer.....	PC056
Greg Jennen .....	PC057
Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group.....	PC058
Caren della Cioppa.....	PC059
David Hart.....	PC060
Janice Tower .....	PC061
Steve Colt.....	PC062
Jared Cummings.....	PC063
Brian Looney .....	PC064
Alaska Trappers Association .....	PC065
Patricia Dicraiker .....	PC066

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Jessie Alloway .....	PC067
Bill Sherwonit .....	PC068
Michael Mandregan .....	PC069
Chugach State Park Citizens' Advisory Board .....	PC070
Northway Village Council .....	PC071
Julie Sadoris .....	PC072
Debrah Carlson .....	PC073
Tom McReynolds.....	PC074
Kent Bowman .....	PC075
JD Batove.....	PC076
Ken Green .....	PC077
Kay Thomas .....	PC078
Cherie Northon.....	PC079
Susan Serna.....	PC080
Gordon Jones .....	PC081
Renee Blake .....	PC082
John Kaiser.....	PC083
Keith Brownsberger .....	PC084
Colin Lindsey .....	PC085
Bryan Judge .....	PC086
Marybeth Holleman .....	PC087
Thomas Eley .....	PC088

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Municipality of Anchorage .....	PC089
Tom Honer .....	PC090
Laura Senddon .....	PC091
Jed Zimmerman .....	PC092
Louis Kane .....	PC093
Jack Reakoff.....	PC094
Maniilaq Association .....	PC095
Maxine Franklin.....	PC096
Paul Chanek .....	PC097
Jeffrey Kramer .....	PC098
Steven Aubry .....	PC099
Martha Wavrin.....	PC100
Johnell Olsson.....	PC101
Martha McGinnis .....	PC102
Craig Doser .....	PC103
Roger Martinez .....	PC104
Judy Kimminau.....	PC105
Lynn Mitchell.....	PC106
Ken & Kate Green .....	PC107
Joanie Martinez.....	PC108
Jos Bakker.....	PC109
Center for Biological Diversity.....	PC110

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Kenneth Wilkinson .....	PC111
Al Barrette.....	PC112
Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge.....	PC113
Dena Selby .....	PC114
Robert Archibald & Roberta Highland .....	PC115
Kachemak Bay Conservation Society.....	PC116
Alaska Backcountry Hunters & Anglers.....	PC117
Jim Broderick.....	PC118
Alaska Bowhunters Association .....	PC119
Kachemak Bay State Parks Citizens Advisory Board .....	PC120
Julian Mason .....	PC121
Carolyn Brodin.....	PC122
David Armstrong .....	PC123
Diane McRoberts Powers .....	PC124
Dianna Whitney .....	PC125
Duncan Keith .....	PC126
Jacky Graham.....	PC127
Janette Cadieux .....	PC128
Rachel Hatcher .....	PC129
Sylve Montalbo.....	PC130
Theo Lexmond.....	PC131
Jennifer McCombs.....	PC132

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Mike Daigneault.....	PC133
Michael Hawley .....	PC134
Matthew Keith .....	PC135
Lynne Doran .....	PC136
Laura Ashlock.....	PC137
William Clay.....	PC138
Jason Bickling.....	PC139
Guy Sachette .....	PC140
Yvette Galbraith.....	PC141
Anne Hope .....	PC142
Linda Feiler.....	PC143
Virginia Morgan.....	PC144
Sandra Holsten .....	PC145
B Atkinson .....	PC146
Daniel Jirak.....	PC147
Northwest Arctic Borough.....	PC148
Stephen Bartell.....	PC149
Tasha Jeffords .....	PC150
Keith Balfourd .....	PC151
Terry Overly.....	PC152
Matt Soloy.....	PC153
Darrin Anderson.....	PC154

**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

Robert Holbrook .....	PC155
Kathryn Recken .....	PC156
Dominic Bauer .....	PC157
Todd Pace.....	PC158
Robert Cassell .....	PC159
Kneeland Taylor.....	PC160
Wayne Hall .....	PC161
Martha Story .....	PC162
David Story .....	PC163
Diana Stone Livingston.....	PC164
Lance Kronberger .....	PC165
Marilyn Houser .....	PC166
Alaska Professional Hunters Association .....	PC167
Bari Cabana.....	PC168
Dana Bertolini.....	PC169
Kevin Asher .....	PC170
Tom Lessard.....	PC171
Mark Corsentino .....	PC172
Janice Crocker.....	PC173
Michael Kistler.....	PC174
Yolanda Dela Cruz.....	PC175
Ethan Williams.....	PC176



**ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**  
**Southcentral Region Meeting**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**  
**March 13-17, 2015**  
*On Time Public Comment Index*

April Warwick .....	PC177
Luke Graham .....	PC178
Colt Foster.....	PC179
Mark Luttrell.....	PC180
Bruce Graham .....	PC181
Stefanie [Unknown] .....	PC182
Dave Sullivan.....	PC183
Marilyn Houser .....	PC184
Lesa Miller .....	PC185
Kris Malecha.....	PC186
John Campbell .....	PC187
Mark Stiller .....	PC188
JoeRay Skrha .....	PC189
Jake Jacobsen.....	PC190
Greg Waisanen.....	PC191
Greg Pepperd .....	PC192
Darcy Davis .....	PC193
Dan Montgomery .....	PC194



Submitted By  
Keith Balfour  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 10:37:33 AM  
Affiliation  
Boone and Crockett Club

Phone  
4065421888

Email  
[keith@boone-crockett.org](mailto:keith@boone-crockett.org)

Address  
250 Station Drive  
Missoula, Montana 59801

The Boone and Crockett Club was responsible for establishing the first piece of game law legislation protecting the wildlife of the newly formed Territory of Alaska in 1902. By the early 1960s the Club noted the increased use of aircraft in hunting and promoted the concept that using a plane to spot, land, and then shoot big game was not fair chase and helped to establish laws restricting such aircraft use. The Boone and Crockett Club does not support any type aerial scouting to locate big game species for hunting purposes and would support PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 92.085 if this were also to become law.



Submitted By  
Terry Overly Jr  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 11:55:04 AM  
Affiliation  
Caribou Outfitter 26A

Phone  
907 505 0290  
Email  
[terry1605@gmail.com](mailto:terry1605@gmail.com)  
Address  
po box 782  
Tok, Alaska 99780

( Proposal 202 Oposse ) --Proposal 202 presents an arbitrary approach to game management that imposes undue burden on Alaskan enterprise, jeopardizes the long-term revenue stream for game management and does not present a method that is reasonably calculated to enhance caribou survival statistics.

According to the ADF&G statistics presented only 5% of the 14,000 harvested animals from the Western Arctic herd comes from hunters who are not resident to the area. That totals 700 caribou. Statistics on non-resident hunters for the Teshekpuk herd are not presented but local community hunting pressure is represented as accounting for a harvest of approximately 2400. Assuming a similar ratio (although such ratio is highly unlikely given the more difficult access to the Teshekpuk herd) the impact of non-resident hunters is negligible accounting for a total of 120 caribou. However, the impact of the proposed rule change is many times higher in terms of available harvest and will create more problems than it solves. As a rule, Proposal 202 seeks to impose the bulk of the restriction on non-residents but at numbers so low as to make virtually no contribution to the long-term game management plans for the areas herd. Assuming that in fact the reduction in available harvest correlates directly to a decrease in the actual harvest, reducing the bag limit from 5 to 2 would result in a total reduction in harvest of 480 animals. At a 5 to 1 reduction that is only an additional 240 caribou out of more than 14,000 harvested. Proportionally, the reduction in non-resident bag limit does little to actually adjust the harvest but it does discourage non-resident fees.

The inordinate imposition of these restrictions to non-residents will in fact produce a limiting effect on the taking of other game such as wolves and bears. A review of the statistics of non-resident tag purchases demonstrates a high number of wolf and grizzly tags accompany the purchase of caribou tags by non-residents. Traveling to Alaska and paying the license and tag fees to the state is a high expense and the numbers of non-resident hunters have fallen in comparison to resident hunters according to ADF&G statistics published on their website. Non-resident revenue is valuable because it helps directly underwrite the expense of performing the very surveys that led to the publishing of Proposal 202. Limiting the opportunities at such a disproportionate level will limit the attractiveness to non-residents of using the resources in Alaska - perhaps to the long term detriment of game management revenue. As stated in the supporting documentation to Proposal 202 one of the primary factors believed to be at play in the reduction of the caribou herd is natural predation. Accordingly, creating a game management policy and rule that would create a likely decrease in the hunting pressure on predators makes little sense. In fact, a more sound policy would couple a reduction in predator tag fees for non-residents. Combined with a more reasonable reduction in annual bag limits on caribou this would produce a decrease in overall hunting pressure on caribou with an increase in hunting pressure on predators.

A more reasonable proposal would seek to place less restriction on non-resident quotas coupled with an incentive to pressure predators as appropriate in the various GMU's. A bag limit of 2 caribou per season would result in a 60 % reduction in the total limit for non-residents and would be more reasonable.

Thanks Terry Overly JR R-935



Submitted By  
Matt Soloy  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 11:57:12 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
232-9597  
Email  
[matt\\_soloy@hotmail.com](mailto:matt_soloy@hotmail.com)  
Address  
P.O. Box 874645  
Wasilla, Alaska 99687

Comments on Proposal 207

Matt Soloy

Proposal 207 will not solve issues with declining sheep populations. It will only single out a group of resident Alaska hunters that are seriously dedicated to sheep hunting and conservation. Proposal 207 will create a variety of issues including, law enforcement, crowding, air traffic congestion before season, hunter conflicts, personal opportunities, and unequal advantages to guides. My last statement from the mat-su meeting expands on a few of those issues. (RC 067).

A couple of questions to ask yourself.....

-If somebody invested the time and money to learn how to shoot at 800 yards, would it be fair to take that advantage away?

-If somebody spent their life training themselves to be in better physical condition to access sheep habitat, would it be fair to restrict them?

-If somebody invested in better hunting gear in order to gain an advantage with, sustainability, glassing, shooting, hiking, packing, stamina, accessibility. Would it be fair to take that advantage away?

-If somebody invested in a top of the line ATV to help with accessibility would it be right to take that advantage away?

The point is, not everybody has the same advantage for hunting. It is up to the individual what advantages they make for themselves. Most hunters that don't have aircraft do not know how much effort it takes to hunt with an aircraft to actually make it an advantage. In most cases there is no conflict with hunters using aircraft and hunters not using aircraft. This is because hunters with aircraft will access areas that would be impossible by foot. This to me, helps with any congestion problems because it spreads hunters out. If the board feels the need to restrict hunters, let's start with non-residents first.

I believe that sheep hunters can work together on this. Predation is a large part of the problem and I think having a predator control program would make a significant difference. One issue is that many working residents do not have the time to dedicate to a predator control program. (Unit 16 predator control was a huge success for moose!!!) I think if we raised the cost of sheep tags as well as implemented a trophy fee to non-residents we could use that funding to pay for predator control. Coyotes and wolves are doing more damage to sheep population than conservative hunters ever will. I would be happy to pay people that do have time to take predators during the winter months in sheep habitat. A bounty may be a great way to entice people into taking predators. Lots of ideas to expand on this subject and I think it could ultimately lead to sustainable sheep hunting.

Successful or not every year I enjoy sheep hunting. Part of the experience is the flying. Taking away a part of the sheep hunting experience that a lot of us have worked so hard for would discourage support with many other issues at hand. Thank you for your consideration.



Submitted By  
Darrin Anderson  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 2:18:21 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-745-6432  
Email  
[flynfish@mac.com](mailto:flynfish@mac.com)  
Address  
3290 South Lakeshore Loop  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Board of Game,

I oppose proposal 207, all changes for the use of aircraft for sheep hunting. I would suggest you focus more on conservation for Dall Sheep rather than regulation of aircraft stated in proposal 207. From a conservation stand point, if you managed Dall Sheep harvest like the other areas already done in the state through a permit drawing system for that area. It would allow Dall Sheep populations to be managed properly. Ultimately Dall Sheep management is essential to sustain a good population for all residents, non residents, guides, transporters, and air taxi services. The state could also award concessions to qualified registered guides like the federal managed areas already do. This allows everyone to be on the same playing field looking out for the best interest of the Dall Sheep populations in the state, rather than penalize the people using aircraft. Proposal 207 would encure more cost for the state of Alaska through enforcement when we could use those cost for conservation such as additional survey work, draw permitting, guide use concessions, ect. These principals/regulations are in effect in other areas of the state already why not model a management plan after them.

Regards,

Darrin Anderson

Palmer Alaska



Submitted By  
Robert Holbrook  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 3:15:41 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-888-9650  
Email  
[sterlingholbrook@yahoo.com](mailto:sterlingholbrook@yahoo.com)  
Address  
po box 83864  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99708

Board Members,

First thank you for your service to the state of Alaska. I would like to comment on proposal 202 concerning the Western Arctic Caribou and particularly the herd hunt changes. I have watched this decline for several years with concern and agree they need help. I feel the main culprit is climate change and ice. I believe the best way to help is to reduce cow and calf harvest. You need to do more in this area. I am not a guide but an out of area resident hunter but in all fairness I believe with your changes the season starts too late for non-residents. After mid-september in the Coleville river area the weather is too unreliable and the few guides I know in that area try to get out. I propose an earlier start to the nonresident season. I also believe the harvest for non-residents should be 2 Bulls. Most of the non-resident hunts there are "Hunts of a lifetime" and being able to take 2 bulls will not reduce numbers. Very few of these non-residents will take more than one bull but many will buy a grizzly and wolf tag and would help with predation issue. Only reduction of cow and calf harvest offers a slim chance of help with this natural decline. The non-resident changes are only to placate local hunters and will hurt the commission by cutting off needed revenue during a time of falling budgets. I would also hope that enforcement and local peer pressure in the villages will reduce waste of their valuable food source as has occasional been seen in the past.

Thank you for your consideration,

Robert Holbrook



Submitted By  
Kathryn Recken  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 3:20:28 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907 595-1769  
Email  
[Krecken@gmail.com](mailto:Krecken@gmail.com)

Address  
19567 Rusty's Way  
PO Box 747  
Cooper Landing, Alaska 99572

I support proposal 180 to limit the areas where trapping is allowed in the Cooper Landing area. I live in Cooper Landing year round, and hike, pick berries, hunt mushrooms, and fish the streams and lakes in the area. I believe I have the right to pursue all these activities without fear of harm from a trap someone has set and left unmarked. The Cooper Landing area is no longer a wilderness area and its recreational user groups have grown in both numbers and diversity. It is no longer an appropriate area for the trapping of game.

Submitted By  
Dominic Bauer  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 3:43:30 PM  
Affiliation



PC157  
1 of 1

I support proposal 180. Lets get trapping off the Kenai Peninsula all together. Trappers are an extreme minority who are receiving a disproportionate amount of the resource(land) compared to the recreational users(bikers, hikers, skiers etc...





Submitted By  
todd pace  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 4:15:04 PM  
Affiliation  
ak RESIDENT

Phone  
907 357 2924  
Email  
[TPACE@MTAONLINE.NET](mailto:TPACE@MTAONLINE.NET)  
Address  
5966 E CUMULUS CIRCLE  
PALMER, Alaska 99645

I just read the proposal to limit aircraft for sheep hunting purposes. Really? Why not limit people to archery only or sling shots, or only rock throwing? Maybe make it limited to access by pogo stick only? I am an avid sheep hunter and pilot, and believe this is a stupid response that doesn't address the real issues of limited sheep numbers, not to mention the hugely impossible task of trying to enforce it. When is Alaska's fish and game board going to wake to the fact that our fish and game are not unlimited resources. Every other state in the nation has realized this years ago and have taken the necessary step to limit hunting pressure by going to state wide draws. I realize that this is wildly unpopular, especially among the guides who populate these boards, and will limit my ability to hunt as well. States that have done so have now reaped the reward of vastly increased size and quality of their herds. There is no need to reinvent the wheel here. Pick any one of the western states as a model. I think it about time that this board grow a pair and make some real decision that will affect the long term quantity and quality of our herds, make some bandaid attempt that only affect a few. One other question? Is this the lowest hanging fruit that can address the issue? Really? Airplanes? I write this with zero confidence that this board listens to any outside voices, and am confident that this decision is already made, and this letter does little except give a forum for people to vent. Get out of your bubble, the answers to these problems has already been solved many times over and it wasn't by limiting airplanes.

Submitted By  
Robert Cassell  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 7:56:56 PM  
Affiliation



PC159  
1 of 1

I strongly appose the Board of Game proposal 207 and 208 and have testified to this at the last game board meeting.



Submitted By  
Kneeland Taylor  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 9:05:45 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-276-6219  
Email  
[kneelandtaylor@ak.net](mailto:kneelandtaylor@ak.net)  
Address  
2244 Loussac Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99517

To the members of the Board of Game

Proposals 180 and 181. Support. Road trapping and trapping on recreational hiking trails, ski trails, etc. needs to be stopped. Conflicts between user groups should be avoided; and the interests of hikers, skiers, and non consumptive users should be respected.

Proposal 150. Oppose. I ski, run, and bike in Kincaid Park on average at least once a week, all year long. I like seeing moose, but understand that you need to keep your distance, both for the sake of the moose, and also for safety reasons. One of my children attended Junior Nordic at Kincaid when he was 9 and 10 years old, and one of my other children skied at Kincaid for two years as a teenager with the West High ski team. For these reasons, I recognize the safety issue. But the way to deal with safety is NOT to authorize a hunt for recreational purposes, whether the hunters be deserving citizens, or otherwise. Instead, the safety issue should be dealt with by the Department's wildlife biologists, who should use deterrence tools such as rubber bullets and similar techniques; even the occasional killing of a moose that is identified as harrassing hikers, skiers, etc.

I note for the record that there are both black and brown bears at Kincaid. I have seen both at Kincaid Park within the last six months. My point being that there is inherent danger in having wildlife in Anchorage, and in Kincaid Park. I strongly favor having wildlife in our city and in our park. Please, you have the entire state [with very small exceptions] in which to hunt. Don't take away one of the very last places in Alaska where people like me can enjoy our wildlife.

Very truly yours, Kneeland Taylor



Submitted By  
Wayne Hall  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 8:56:22 PM  
Affiliation  
none

This is to state my opposition to **Proposal 150**, the Kincaid Park special interest moose hunt. There is no public safety issue that would be addressed by a hunt in Kincaid. To the contrary, public safety would be negatively impacted by any such hunt itself. The Municipality of Anchorage recognizes the hazards and negative impacts this would generate and they have opposed any such hunt. Discharge of firearms within Municipal parks is specifically prohibited. Use of ATVs in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge would damage important wildlife habitat. Closing the park to all other users for several weeks at any time of year is both absurd and unfair. It would also be costly for ADF&G and the Municipality to try to implement. And the moose population in the park could not sustain this hunt. It would be better utilized for viewing by the majority of residents and visitors who are not hunters. Reject Proposal 150.

I would also like to support **the Emergency Petition** to re-establish a buffer zone around portions of Denali National Park and Preserve in which the killing of wolves by hunting or trapping would be prohibited. In eight years the wolf population of Denali declined by 65% to just 50 wolves in 2014. Besides their utility in a healthy ecosystem, wolves in the Denali region are worth much more to the State through tourist and resident visitation to the area than they are to the very few trappers who are responsible for the majority of the reported wolf kill there. Re-institute the buffer zone and protect this important wildlife resource.

I am quite sure no one on the Board of Game will read these comments, let alone consider them, but they will a part of the public record regardless.

Submitted By  
Martha Story  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 9:04:33 PM  
Affiliation



PC162  
1 of 1

I support a 200 feet setback for trapping on all trails, roads, and public beaches in the Cooper Landing and Moose Pass area. Trapping near public areas can lead to pets getting caught in traps and many of the trails and roads are heavily used.

Submitted By  
David Story  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 9:12:45 PM  
Affiliation



PC163  
1 of 1

I support Proposal 180 and setbacks of 200' from the described areas.



Submitted By  
Diana Stone Livingston  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 11:08:26 PM  
Affiliation  
Girdwood Resident; Girdwood 2020

Phone  
907-783-2128  
Email  
[dstoneliv@livingstonalaska.com](mailto:dstoneliv@livingstonalaska.com)  
Address  
P O Box 580  
Girdwood, Alaska 99587

I am commenting to support Board of Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area. This is a proposal to prohibit trapping within 250 feet of any road that leads to public or private property in the Cooper Landing area. I am in support of all restrictions proposed in proposal 180 including restrictions on trapping within 250 feet of multi-use trails and campgrounds and other special area closures in the defined area. I support this proposal because it contains means by which trapping related deaths and injuries can be mitigated, and conflicts regarding trapping in multi-use area can be controlled. We need to be cognizant of the need to make multi-use areas safe and attractive to residents and visitors.

Submitted By  
Lance Kronberger  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 11:11:49 PM  
Affiliation



PC165  
1 of 2

PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Modify sheep hunting opportunities statewide.

Potential changes to use of aircraft for sheep hunting:

1. From August 10 to September 20 aircraft may only be used to place hunters and camps, maintain existing camps, and salvage meat and trophies while used for the purpose of Dall sheep hunting. Using an aircraft for the purpose of spotting sheep or locating Dall sheep during the open hunting season is prohibited.
2. 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.
3. 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.

### **Support #1 of proposal 207.**

**It has been a long standing fact that spotting sheep from the air with the purpose to pursue is not "Fair Chase". Boone & Crockett has defined Fair Chase for many years and even to enter an animal into the B&C record book you have to sign an affidavit that you did not spot the animal from the air. Please see below.**

For the purpose of entry into the Boone and Crockett Club's® records, North American big game harvested by the use of the following methods or under the following conditions are ineligible: I. Spotting or herding game from the air, followed by landing in its vicinity for the purpose of pursuit and shooting;

**The accepted practice of spotting sheep from the air (Trophy Judging) among Alaska hunting guides and resident hunters has become accepted and even recommended as "Fair Chase" within Alaska. I believe this practice is wrong and is not "Fair Chase". The Alaska BOG would be doing the sheep of Alaska a great disservice to continue to allow this practice to happen. Not only does it increase harvest of mature rams it also puts undue stress on the sheep. The way hunters and guides are using their aircraft is not "Fair Chase" and to not put a stop to it now, would only encourage the practice going forward. The advancement of technology and the number of people that now have access to super cub aircraft has been one of the impacts on our sheep population.**

Proposal 153 Limit the number of next of kin nonresident sheep tags in Unit 14C.

**Next of Kin have taken over the non-resident sheep draw. I have tried multiple times to get the exact data from ADFG regarding the % of NOK drawing tags in 14C but can not get anyone to get me the information. I do know that in 2014 of the 12 non-resident sheep tags 5 went to NOK. In the TOK over the last 5 years 50% of the non resident tags have went to NOK and there would even be a greater % of non resident tags going to NOK if they did not cap it at 50%. The Brinkman survey is just that a survey, 50% of the tags non-res sheep tags going to NOK is fact. I believe in 2012 ADFG did not check the % of tags in the TOK that were issued to NOK (4 of 6 non-res tags went to NOK) and they had to issue another TOK non-res tag to meet their own requirement.**

**The number on NOK that are applying for the limited non-res tags is growing at an incredible rate. But the number of Guided non-res applicants is dropping as they see the reduction of tags, and the chances of drawing getting out of sight with the number on NOK applicants. As the population continues to grow within the state it is only a matter of time before NOK are taking all the non-res tags thus making sheep guide businesses in draw areas no longer viable.**

**Along with that there is an abuse of the NOK hunts taking place. Each year we have a NOK hunter that has drawn a Drawing Sheep tag that is looking to hire a packer. They do not want to pay for a guide, they just want someone to come along and help them carry all the stuff that goes along with a backpack sheep hunt. When I explain they cannot hire just a packer, and they need a licensed guide then they just say they will just do the hunt themselves. I then explain that the NOK they applied with has to accompany them on their hunt and they say something like "There is no way my Grandma from Fairbanks is going on a backpack sheep hunt with me". This is happening all the time, and if not randomly checked by the troopers they go hunting illegally. The NOK non-res drawing needs to be a separate DS # and needs to have additional measures taken to make sure the resident they are putting down on the application is a verified NOK and will be accompanying them on their hunt.**





154 Increase the number of nonresident goat drawing permits on Unit 14C.

**Underutilized resource. The Goat population is very good within 14C. Harvest is very low due to t...  
hunt. There is a reason for a guide! A goat is a big animal that lives in very tough terrain. With 14C being a no airplane  
landing area it makes these goat hunts very physical and the need for a guide is very obvious. That is why I propose to  
increase the number of Guided Non-resident goat hunts within 14C. Guides not only help with the sexing and trophy judging,  
but also bring the horsepower that is needed to get these animals out of the remote areas they live in. There are no losers  
with the increase of a few guided goat tags, only winners.**



Submitted By  
Marilyn Houser  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 11:22:18 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072782122  
Email  
[lostinspace@matnet.com](mailto:lostinspace@matnet.com)  
Address  
2411 Ingra Street  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

~~Proposal 170: Support

I support this proposal submitted by USFWS. Human caused mortality of brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula is at a level these slow recruiting animals cannot sustain. The liberalization of brown bear hunting regulations in 2012 that included a 9-month open season and one bear every regulatory year beginning in 2012 has taken a toll on the brown bear population.

Proposals 173, 174: Oppose

Removal of the meat salvage requirement for brown bears killed over bait would be legalizing wanton waste. Brown bears were considered a trophy animal not that long ago. Now hunters just want to kill them and leave the meat behind to rot.

Proposals 180, 181: Support

I support these proposals. In areas of high use, it makes good sense to require a 250 setback for setting traps and snares. It is past time there be regulation like this, rather than the trapper associations saying they encourage trappers to steer clear of areas where there likely will be conflict only to get hit with really bad press when someone's pet is caught in a trap or snare.



Submitted By  
Thor Stacey  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 7:56:56 AM  
Affiliation  
alaska professional hunters association

Phone  
907 723 1494  
Email  
[thorstacey@gmail.com](mailto:thorstacey@gmail.com)  
Address  
po box 211231  
Auke Bay, Alaska 99821

## ALASKA

### PROFESSIONAL HUNTER ASSOCIATION, INC.

P.O. Box 240971, Anchorage, AK 99524

Phone: [\(907\) 929-0619](tel:(907)929-0619) ~ [\(907\)-868-1562](tel:(907)868-1562)

Email: [office@alaskaprohunter.org](mailto:office@alaskaprohunter.org) ~ [www.alaskaprohunter.org](http://www.alaskaprohunter.org)

February 26, 2015

Dear Alaska Board of Game Members,

Please find the following comments regarding proposals you will be considering during the March meeting in Anchorage. The Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. (APHA) is opposed to attempts to change non-resident allocation formulas established in Board Policy (2007-173-BOG). APHA members rely on fair and predictable allocation to non-resident hunters based on defensible biological parameters that are in line with the principles of sustained yield and result in a maximum benefit to ALL users. The APHA maintains its support of the Board's current allocative policies and believes that the well-defined, species specific, resident preferences are in the best interests of all Alaskans.

#### **Second Degree of Kindred:**

Alaska's Professional Hunters have recently (past 10 years) struggled with developing a clear position on allocation of tags to non-residents hunting with Alaskan relatives within the 2nd degree of kindred. AS 16.05.407 clearly delineates who can accompany non-resident hunters pursuing; Dall Sheep, Brown/Grizzly Bear and Mountain Goats. What is not clear and therefore the within the purview of the Board of Game (BOG), is how those tags should be allocated. Should non-resident relatives be considered residents or non-residents, or should they be set aside in their own category? Without clear statutory direction, the BOG has implemented a variety of allocation strategies in a pragmatic effort to address allocation concerns across a vast State with different needs and scenarios. At this point, the APHA does not see the need for statutory allocation direction or a statewide BOG policy on 2nd degree of kindred provisions. However, the BOG should always seek to derive the maximum benefit from our game resources while making preferences between beneficial users. **Where game populations are subject to more demand for harvest than supply; we ask that the BOG recognize that guided non-residents have a much higher associated benefit to the State than unguided non-residents.**

#### **Guide Industry Facts (McDowell 2014):**

- 89% of licensed Guides are Alaska Residents (Registered / Master Guides)
- \$78 Million of Total Economic Activity
- \$51 Million in New Dollars to the State Economy
- \$13 Million in wages in **Rural Alaska**

- \$12 Million in spending on Goods and Services in **Rural Alaska**
- \$1.95 Million in Direct Revenue (ADF&G) in Non-Resident License & Tag sales
- Contributed to the \$14.9 million in Pitman-Robertson funds in 2012
- Guided Hunting Provided 2,210 jobs



Regardless of whether or not a big game animal is a guide required species or not, professional guide services provide added value and benefit to Alaska's economy, especially in rural Alaska. Guided hunters are also more likely to transfer possession of their meat to their guides, who in turn share that meat with local communities and other Alaskans. Much of this activity is for animals that are not guide required thus no 2nd degree of kindred provision. Guided hunts provide Alaskan jobs and support rural infrastructure all the while keeping much of the valuable meat in Alaska.

Second degree of kindred hunts, on the other hand, provide little added value to the economy and a high likelihood of harvested meat leaving the State. What 2nd degree of kindred hunts do provide for is family hunting connections and heritage. The value of the hunting tradition and this heritage is something that all hunters recognize. As a group of hunters, the APHA recognizes this value. This balance of resource valuation allows us to support limiting the number on 2nd degree of kindred hunters for brown bear in unit 4 while supporting family hunts for black bears in region I.

### **Carry Over Comments from the 2014 Board of Game Cycle:**

*"The APHA is in strong support of the Board and Department's efforts to form a sheep-working group. We feel strongly that this group should incorporate voices from stakeholders across the state. To this effect, we request that hunting guides are considered "stakeholders" and that persons responsible for the formation and implementation of this group are provided information to this effect. We maintain our participation in this group is historically justified and that our knowledgeable perspective will be essential to its ultimate success. We see the goal of the working group as:*

*to have a robust discussion, in a think-tank format, that presents current understandings of sheep biology and sheep harvest information (Alaska) to a group of diverse, knowledgeable Alaskan stakeholders who incorporate their perspectives in the drafting of a statewide sheep management plan that relies on a set of pre-determined, agreed upon, management tools the Board of Game shall adopt to achieve the goals and objectives the group sets for a sustainable future for Alaska sheep hunting.*

*We strongly suggest that the management tools include not only "stop-gap" measures to conserve the resource but, given abundance, opportunity liberalizations as well. Alaska's final sheep management plan should be made easily available to the public and then allowed to run its course for 10 years before it is revisited. Our 10-year recommendation is based on recognition of the need for biological and social compromise. First, we considered the cyclical nature of Alaska's game populations and our northern latitude that can retard the effects of management changes (up to 20+ years). It is quite probable that ten years will be an insufficient timeline to measure the full biological effects, on a statewide basis, of a newmanagement strategy. Second, we believe that given Alaska's current rate of population growth and the short average length of residency, 10-years will be about as long as the public will understand and accept the working group's results. We feel that the 10-year goal is a good compromise that allows for public re-appraisal while giving newmanagement practices some time to run their course. The recent reappraisal and subsequent validation of the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Plan (January 2013, Sitka BOG meeting) is an excellent example of the net positive effects this type of working group can have for the resource and the surrounding social climate. The Sheep working group is a timely project and has our strong support.*

*As you consider our positions we urge you to keep in mind that Alaska's professional guide industry represents a significant and important economy in rural Alaska. In addition to the "newdollars" the guide industry brings to rural Alaska and the private sector at large, our client's tag and license purchases directly and indirectly, through matching Federal funds, provide the "lion's share" of ADF&G's funding. The health of our industry is dependent upon prudent stewardship and conservation of Alaska's wildlife as well as fair allocation. It is precisely because of our stewardship principles, and respect for all users and a fair allocation process, that our members maintain deep community ties across our vast State. Alaska's professional hunters ask that when you consider the below comments you remain mindful that it's in our best interest to have abundant game as well as a healthy, inclusive social situation that is in the best interest of ALL Alaskan's."*

### **Individual Proposal Comments**

Below you will find our comments on individual proposals under your consideration for Region II. Leading up to the drafting of these comments the APHA held a tele-conference and invited all of its members to participate in the drafting of these comments. This tele-conference was well attended with good representation from guides who conduct hunts in Region II. You will find that there are some proposals that we don't have comments listed for. These were proposals that we felt did not directly impact guides or that are outside of the group's purview. We also chose, in a couple of instances, to group similar proposals together and combine our recommendations. While these comments represent the voice of our group, you will undoubtedly get comments from APHA members who want their individual positions considered as well. Because the APHA takes a statewide perspective when approaching Board proposals, we urge

you to consider regional expertise from our members even when their position is different from that of the APHA. We urge you to reach out to our membership for clarity and details on proposals before you vote on a regional basis. Given the opportunity, Alaska's hunting guides will continue to bring a wealth of wildlife and hunting experience to the table.



### **Proposal #207- Oppose**

This is a non-allocative and non-conservation based issue, and can be very divisive. We would encourage the board to stay focused on working on the more important issues of crowding, allocation and conservation through a sheep-working group.

### **Proposal #208- Discussion- Recommendation**

We would like to thank the Board for putting this proposal out for discussion. At this time the APHA is unable to develop a strong internal consensus on the variety of options that are proposed here. However, as a result of discussion prompted by this proposal, we have been able to develop strong consensus in some areas:

#### **Conservation:**

**APHA members, broadly, think we have real conservation concerns with sheep in Alaska. This is a point of strong consensus.**

#### **Resident Draw/Crowding:**

The APHA is ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to any form of resident draw to address crowding, no matter how short.

Drawing hunts should always be considered a last option and they should be used to manage harvest, not crowding. There are many, many options that can be used to address crowding some examples, for discussion purposes follow:

- Rotating season dates on a harvest tag basis
- Dividing effort up in a fair, yet predictable manner to spread effort out (alphabet, random "number," residents can pick their season dates, etc.)
- Rotating the first ten day hunt period based on a "once every 2(3)(4), year" basis

To be clear, the APHA is not endorsing any of the above options. The APHA supports a SHEEP WORKING GROUP to work through these kinds of options and asks that the board recognize that this is the best format to get **stakeholder "buy in"** on restrictions that will ultimately affect ALL users.

#### **State Land/Federal Land:**

APHA members agree that the conflicts over allocation differ depending on whether we are talking about state or federal land. Proposal 208 recognizes that difference.

#### **Sheep Working Group:**

The APHA maintains absolute positive support for a *Sheep Working Group*. This is the only type of format where we can work together to not only manage the resource and hunters but set goals and desired outcomes for the actions of the board, both now and in the future. Sheep and sheep hunting are worth our effort.

#### **Recommendation:**

Use proposal #208 as the "vehicle" for a statewide proposal created by a *sheep working group*. This will allow for FULL A/C input before next year's statewide meeting in March.

### **Proposal #141- Support**

We support this proposal as written, based on the stated conservation concerns brought forward by the Copper River/Prince William Sound A/C. We would also support other viable Mt. goat management alternatives (i.e. point system, public education on sex identification) to address conservation concerns expressed in this proposal. We do not support managing under drawing system as an alternative to the proposal. The APHA supports solving conservation concerns, without going to drawing hunt management.



### **Proposal #142- Oppose**

We oppose this proposal because non-resident harvest in Unit 8 is a minor component of deer mortality. Non-resident harvest accounts for approximately 10% of the unit-wide harvest, with 85% of that harvest being buck harvest (Kodiak A/C minutes). A low percentage (>15%) of non-resident hunters harvest more than 2 deer.

Deer declines on Kodiak Island are caused by weather, not human harvest. This proposal does not address a real conservation concern and should not be passed.

### **Proposal #143- Strongly Oppose**

We oppose Prop. 143 because our membership has strong feelings about "fair chase" hunting and resource stewardship and conservation. Experience has taught us that bears, in particular, are easy to wound and lose when shots are taken at long range or in other questionable situations. As guides, hunters and conservationists we have both a legal, and moral obligation to ensure that wound loss is minimized. The consequence to the hunter of an animal wounded but not recovered greatly encourages ethical hunting practices, benefits the resource, and improves the overall hunting experience. If Prop. 143 is passed, more hunters will tend to take questionable shots, and more animals will be wounded and lost.

We urge you to carefully read the letter from C.U.B.S. on this issue. Kodiak Island is home to the largest sub-species of coastal brown bears in the world. Kodiak's bear management plan is widely regarded as one of Alaska's premiere programs. One important aspect of this plan is the respect we show for the animals by discouraging wound-loss. We urge you to fail this proposal and maintain the public's trust in hunter's respect for Kodiak Island's bears.

### **Proposal #151- Support**

We support this proposal, as written, for the stated conservation concerns. Alaska does not have any "spare" ewes in its sheep population currently. We urge you to pass this proposal because our membership has similar conservation concerns as those expressed by the Anchorage A/C.

### **Proposal #152- Oppose**

Overview:

Proposal #152 simply seeks to exclude non-resident hunters, who are already held to a low percentage of overall hunter effort, in all of 14C, except for one governor's tag. We strongly oppose proposal #152 because it is not conservation based but purely allocative in nature.

Governor's Tag:

Presently there is one "governor's tag" issued for the Chugach Range (units 14C, 14A and 13D). This tag generally sells for very substantial sums of money, most of which returns to ADF&G for conservation purposes. Non-resident hunters, by law, must be accompanied by a licensed guide. Alaska's governor tags are especially attractive because of the highly qualified guide services offered in Alaska. Resident hunters benefit from this relationship because they do not pay for sheep tags.

Guides:

Alaska's guides are statutorily limited to holding a maximum of 3 guide areas at any one time. Proposal #152 would not create an exception to this restriction. The likely result of the passage of Proposal #152 is that the highly qualified guides who currently accompany the Governor's Tag "winners" would not hold this guide area on their license anymore, due to a loss of all other non-resident opportunity.

Summary:

Removing non-resident allocation in 14C is not historically justified and completely unwarranted. Passage of this proposal will result in destabilizing the "Governor's Tag" program. ALL CONSERVATION DOLLARS TO THE DEPARTMENT MATTER AT THIS POINT. The Governor's tag program, on an animal by animal basis, provides an excellent return to the Department in the form of dollars for conservation. Proposal #152 will result in devaluing this opportunity, to the point where passage of this proposal could cost the Department, literally, hundreds of thousands of dollars over time. Meanwhile, local guides (most of the guides who provide services in 14C live locally to the area) will be put out of business in one fell swoop. The APHA strongly opposes this proposal.



## Proposal #153- Support-Amend

### Overview:

Capping the number of 2nd degree of kindred tags where the number of tags is very limited and where the resource is wholly allocated is warranted because guided hunts more effectively maximize the benefit of the resource for Alaskans. Sheep tags in 14C are precious, limited and fully allocated; therefore proposal #153 should pass.

### Resident or Non-resident Allocation:

Proposal #153 seeks to award a total of 2 tags already allotted to non-residents to relatives of Alaska Residents. We ask you to consider three options in how you pass this proposal:

- Option one:

Amend and pass: Take the 2 proposed tags (1 rifle, 1 archery) from the tags allotted to resident take. This is our most preferred option and we think is most consistent with the legislative intent of the 2nd degree of kindred provision. This option maximizes Alaskan families' ability to hunt with their relatives. This also allows for flexibility later on if residents want to argue the value of accompanying their relatives and give them more leeway in the total number of tags that can be issued to their relatives.

- Option two:

Amend and pass: Consider 2nd degree of kindred half resident and half non-resident for purposes of allocation. Take the 2 proposed tags alternatively out of the tags allotted for residents and non-residents on alternate years. This is our second most preferred alternative because it more effectively captures the maximum benefit of the resource than considering relatives non-residents but still reduces the number of guided non-residents.

- Option three:

Pass as written: Take the 2 proposed tags from those allotted to non-resident hunters.

### Status Quo:

If proposal #153 fails, there will be a continued trend of more and more non-resident relatives receiving sheep tags in 14C. From 2004-2013, over ¼ of the total tags available to non-residents were awarded to non-resident relatives. In the most recent 2-3 year period, this number was even higher. In Tok, fully 50% of non-resident tags are currently being awarded to non-resident relatives. There is no doubt that 2nd degree of kindred hunters should be considered in allocation schemes but they should be capped in their number, whether their tags are taken from the resident or non-resident pool. If non-resident relative hunters are not capped for the limited opportunity that the 14C draw offers, they will eventually end up with most of the non-resident tags that are offered thus the maximum value of the resource will not be realized.

## Proposal #154- Support

We fully support proposal #154 with the following recommendations:

1. Recognize that this caps the total number of "guided non-resident" tags available, currently 100% of the available goat tags in DG852, 854 and 858 could go to "guided non-resident" hunters.
2. Allow for 2 "guided non-resident" tags for each of the new proposed drawing hunt opportunities described in proposal #154
3. Make the bag limit: 1 male in new proposed hunts
4. Require a guide-client contract to apply for the "guided non-resident" hunts

We believe the mountain goat resource is very underutilized in these hunt areas, with many of the animals dying of old age rather than being harvested. The department has stated that the harvest goal is 6% of the population. With the very low success rate of these hunts the department could double or triple the permits in these areas. Presently DG 852 has 5 permits; DG 854 has 3 permits; and DG 858 has 5 permits.

## Proposal #158, 159, 160 - Support

We support these proposals to add non-resident opportunity in 15C based on the numbers presented in proposal #158. If there is harvestable surplus and the population is within management objectives, non-resident opportunity should be provided for.



**Proposal #169- Oppose**

We oppose reallocation of the limited sheep resource in Alaska without a stated conservation goal.

**Proposal #170- Oppose**

We oppose proposal #170 because managing Brown bear by a population density estimate from 2010 without consideration of habitat carrying capacity or area wide population estimates is poor management. For instance, how do we know that the estimated bear densities in 2010 were healthy? Restrictions or management plans should be based on solid population and carrying capacity data not one-time high ratios of female harvest.

**Proposal #171- Support**

*We support the Brown bear harvest objectives outlined in proposal #171 while making the same recommendation as in our comments on proposal #170: Restrictions or management plans should be based on solid population and carrying capacity data, not one-time high ratios of female harvest.*

**Proposals #184-190- Oppose**

We oppose all proposals that seek to limit or restrict non-resident allocation without stated conservation concerns.



Submitted By  
Bari Cabana  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 8:25:38 AM  
Affiliation



PC168  
1 of 1

**I SUPPORT Board Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area.** Because trails are multi-use, efforts must be made for the safety of those using trails and roads. A 250 foot "safety zone" along roads and trails is necessary and reasonable to protect people and pets. This proposal does not prohibit one use over the other but instead allows everyone to safely access these places knowing where it is free of traps and where traps may be placed



Submitted By  
Dana Bertolini  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 9:08:44 AM  
Affiliation  
Phone  
9073494503  
Email  
[dana@airtempalaska.com](mailto:dana@airtempalaska.com)  
Address  
3131 E.112thAvenue  
Anchorage, Alaska 99516

I do not own an airplane but I enjoy hunting with friends who own airplanes . I am opposed to the current proposal to limit and restrict the use of aircraft for Dall Sheep hunting . The proposal to delay the time in which a hunter may pursue Sheep after landing, will dramatically affect the ability of folks to enjoy a limited time hunt (long weekend) - this should be an inherent right as a resident to be able to plan for *OR take advantage of bad weather*, to spend a weekend or short- duration hunt!

This proposal would completely eliminate this opportunity ' The proposed restriction to mandate a minimum distance from the landing strip, before pursuing Sheep is absolutely ridiculous! I've seen Sheep move long distances, in short periods of time during hunting season and it's a very real possibility to land late in the day and camp the proposed 5 miles from the Sheep, only to wake up and find them right outside your tent ! This scenario and opportunity is not made possible , nor is an advantage created, exclusively because of the use of aircraft to access the hunting area ! The current same -day airborne restrictions need

Submitted By  
Kevin Asher  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 10:16:40 AM  
Affiliation



PC170  
1 of 1

This proposed change is largely unenforcable, and fairly subjective. You cannot tell whether an aircraft is spotting sheep or recon-ing an lz or ? unless you are in the aircraft. You only think you know. Is this what our already overwhelmed Brown-shirts are expected to do now?

My biggest problem with this proposal is that it is a way for people to feel better, not fix an actual problem. We don't need MORE UNNECESSARY regulation from govt, we need a thought out - solution to a problem. Does this somehow fix (PERCEIVED) overcrowding? Does this put more sheep on the mountain?

Creating regulations that aren't the right fix for the problem doesn't help anyone. This is clearly the case here. I strongly oppose this proposal.

Its a solution looking for a problem.



Submitted By  
Tom Lessard  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 11:25:13 AM  
Affiliation

Prop 177 Support w/amendment. Limit of 5 beaver Oct 20 - November 10; retain April 30 closure.

I have concerns with nontarget catches prior to the November 10 general opener. Most April beaver are much more prime than October beaver.

Prop 178/79 Oppose.

I have concerns with set tampering/disturbance on the part of law enforcement and the potential for mischief as stolen, tagged gear could then be reset illegally.

Prop 180 Oppose

Cooper Landing is a roadside federal subsistence community. The 1990 census recorded 249 while the 2010 census recorded 289 .

(1) Proposal 180 seeks trapping closures based on both perceived Public Safety concerns and actual interactions involving traps and loose running dogs. I am consistently unable to find news reports referencing trap-related injuries to non trappers anywhere in the entire US or Canada.

(2) Kenai National Wildlife implemented a 1 to 2 mile wide by approximately 30 mile long corridor closed to almost all trapping beginning 7 miles from the main business district in Cooper Landing. Additionally, starting 10 miles from town, the Skilak Loop area is totally closed to all trapping along 19 miles of road and a total of 44,000 acres. These restrictions have been in place since at least the mid 80's.

(3) Snowmachine closures implemented by Chugach National Forest in the mid 2000's locked most trappers out of vast, previously accessible trapping grounds. Due to the federal subsistence preference, local residents of Cooper Landing retain priveleged motorized access to these otherwise inaccessible areas.

(4) Prop 180 eliminates existing landowner options for dealing with nuisance wildlife. Landowner permission to trap is already required by existing law.

(5) Proposed setbacks are ineffective and one-sided in the absence of complimentary leash laws.

(6) Trapping activity in the vicinity increases in response to rising fur prices and open lynx seasons. Recent years have seen both open lynx seasons and rising fur prices. Both situations are now reversed and have resulted in predictable decreased trapping effort.

(7) Any trapping restrictions (setbacks) implemented on federal lands under Prop 180 are likely to not apply to local residents due federal subsistence preference.

In response to Prop 180 I have personally spent much time and effort on the behalf of myself and the Alaska Trappers Association (ATA) to include:

Dec. 2012 Communications with Senator Giessel's office regarding community concerns.

Jan. 2013 Granted interview to local reporter including information regarding existing areas closed to trapping near Cooper Landing as noted above.

Jan. 2013 Helped host a Shared Trails Seminar in Cooper Landing on behalf of ATA which include how to recognize the presence of a trapline and hands on instruction as regards the operation of a variety of trapping gear.

Spring 2014 Helped solicit Community input regarding possible locations to consider for mutual voluntary solution.

June 2014 Attended and participated in local meeting between area residents and various agency representatives.

Oct 2014 and Feb 2015 Personally met with author of Prop 180 in order to discuss specific areas to include under the mutual voluntary approach. Neither meeting was successful.

December/January 2014-15 Personally posted cautionary signs aimed at trappers in various locations near Cooper Landing.

Feb/March 2015 Initiated communications with Cooper Landing Planning and Advisory Committee seeking to continue to address user conflict issues in the event Prop 180 fails.

Submitted By  
mark corsentino  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 10:42:28 AM  
Affiliation



PC172  
1 of 1

**I SUPPORT Board Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area to provide a 250 foot no trapping "safety zone" along roads, trails and campgrounds as is necessary and reasonable to protect the multi-users of these trails and facilities. Quite frankly, the proposal is in alignment with ethical trapping practices, and the proposed rules simply allow for enforcement of unethical trapping practices that currently has no enforcement capabilities.**



Submitted By  
Janice Crocker  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 12:08:20 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-783-0333

Email  
[janice\\_crocker@hotmail.com](mailto:janice_crocker@hotmail.com)

Address  
PO Box 476  
Girdwood, Alaska 99587

**I SUPPORT Board Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area.** A 250 foot "safety zone" along roads and trails seems a minimal distance to protect people and pets. By clearly identifying a safe place for trappers and a safe place for people and pets, both groups will benefit and areas can be enjoyed rather than having locals afraid to share these beautiful places with their families and pets and having responsible trappers receiving unfair abuse because of the misguided actions of an inconsiderate few. Having pets, toddlers, and traps all in the same place can only increase tensions between these groups. Providing trappers and young hikers and pet owners with guidelines and distinct usage areas is brilliant in its simplicity. Thank you for considering such a common sense and reasonable proposal.



Submitted By  
Michael Kistler  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 12:19:02 PM  
Affiliation  
Michael Kistler

Good afternoon, my name is Mike Kistler I'm the father of 4 kids, age 8 thru 16, we are a hunting family, and we are opposed to prop 207 for several reasons but mainly because it is hard enough to take kids out of school for any period of time without them paying the price academically, but to change the rules of flying and sheep hunting is to punish kids that can take the time for a two day hunt and turn it into a 48 hour waiting period then hunt, many kids will lose that weekend in the field with their parents because they just can't afford to miss 2 additional days of school.

Thank you, Mike Kistler



Submitted By  
Yolanda Dela Cruz  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 1:58:20 PM  
Affiliation  
Mrs.

Phone  
9072728069  
Email  
[kantor351@hotmail.com](mailto:kantor351@hotmail.com)  
Address  
806 West 57th Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska 99518

The natural resources belong to all Alaskans, therefore I am asking the BOG to vote against this infamous proposal (150) concerning the Kincaid moose hunt. It is unacceptable that the BOG wants to authorize the killing of moose by using them as scapegoats in saying that they care about public safety. These public servers (BOG) should be working on behalf of Alaska and for the best interest of the state and not only working for a select group of people who have nothing else on their mind than kill, kill, and kill. I have been attending Advisories and BOG meetings and have been targeted and silenced by the Advisories and the BOG because these public servers do not share my ideas in preserving the natural resources for future generations. I am asking the BOG, how many people have been killed by moose as opposed to humans? People are suppose to be more intelligent and take precautions when they go to parks. When people moved to Alaska they should know that there is wildlife here, after all the wildlife was put here and Indigenous people have been sharing this beautiful land for thousand of years and both have survived. By the way in order to have balance, we need diversity in the Advisories and in the Board of Game from subsistence and tourism individuals but so far there is only one kind of people in the Advisories and in the Board of Game, sports hunters, and there is no representation for subsistence and tourism. Living moose and other wildlife are very highly valued in the tourism industry drawing a source of revenue for the entire community and the state. Once again, I strongly oppose this infamous proposal (150) about the Kincaid moose hunt. The natural resources belong to all Alaskans, therefore I am asking the BOG to vote against this infamous proposal (150) concerning the Kincaid moose hunt. It is unacceptable that the BOG wants to authorize the killing of moose by using them as scapegoats in saying that they care about public safety. These public servers (BOG) should be working on behalf of Alaska and for the best interest of the state and not only working for a select group of people who have nothing else on their mind than kill, kill, and kill. I have been attending Advisories and BOG meetings and have been targeted and silenced by the Advisories and the BOG because these public servers do not share my ideas in preserving the natural resources for future generations. I am asking the BOG, how many people have been killed by moose as opposed to humans? People are suppose to be more intelligent and take precautions when they go to parks. When people moved to Alaska they should know that there is wildlife here, after all the wildlife was put here and Indigenous people have been sharing this beautiful land for thousand of years and both have survived. By the way in order to have balance, we need diversity in the Advisories and in the Board of Game from subsistence and tourism individuals but so far there is only one kind of people in the Advisories and in the Board of Game, sports hunters, and there is no representation for subsistence and tourism. Living moose and other wildlife are very highly valued in the tourism industry drawing a source of revenue for the entire community and the state. Once again, I strongly oppose this infamous proposal (150) about the Kincaid moose hunt.





Submitted By  
Ethan Williams  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 2:02:01 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072328382  
Email  
[ethanw@mtaonline.net](mailto:ethanw@mtaonline.net)  
Address  
P.O. Box 872691  
Wasilla, Alaska 99687

Dear Mr Chairman and Board Of Game Members,

Concerning Proposal 207, I feel that these restrictions of aircraft use have nothing to do with the management of the resource. There will be no fewer sheep harvested because of these changes. The residents will be hindered the most as not all have 10 days to two weeks for a hunt, especially our youth. As it sits with the proposal to not allow sheep scouting during the season, the airplane owners and airtaxis will all want to go opening day so that they will know where the sheep are. There also has to be taken into consideration the current split seasons. The enforcement of this type of regulation would be a nightmare. What is the difference between scouting for sheep or caribou? This is a people management tool, not a game management method.

Concerning Proposal 208, I am for the limited draw for non residents for the entire season. According to Article 8 of the Alaska State Constitution, the resources of Alaska are to be managed for the benefit of its residents and for a maximum sustained yield. We need to limit non-residents as they are taking 40% of our already depleted sheep population. A 20% harvest for non residents would be more acceptable. Even at that rate, the opportunity is way more lenient than most States that have sheep hunts. If fees are an issue, the Department could increase a non resident tag to \$1,500 and a resident tag to \$200 and no one would bat an eye. Concerning resident hunters under Proposal 208, there should be no limits to the amount of time they have in the field. Once again this is managing and restricting resident hunters and has nothing to do with putting more sheep on the mountain.

Overall, the current management program of sheep at the Department of Fish and Game needs to be revisited and reworked. Time is of the essence and until we have all the information, such as true sheep numbers, intelligent management decisions will be difficult.

Thank You for your time and consideration.

Ethan Williams

907-232-8382

[ethanw@mtaonline.net](mailto:ethanw@mtaonline.net)



Submitted By  
April Warwick  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 2:57:56 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073387777

Email  
[awarwick@ak.net](mailto:awarwick@ak.net)

Address  
5716 Kennyhill Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

I'm writing to ask that you do not allow a moose hunt at Kincaid Park. It is a horrible idea. Kincaid park needs its moose to keep its value, moose numbers are low, why make them lower? People in Denali National Park learn how to camp around bears, people in Anchorage and learn how to get around a moose in Anchorage. Moose make Anchorage special, killing them is taking away what makes us special. Hunting in a popular park is a major safety concern for people. It is a bad idea just like the Predator Control Program, please vote against it.



Submitted By  
Luke Graham  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 3:43:44 PM  
Affiliation

Proposal #186 Support

Proposal #207 Oppose

Proposal #208 Oppose

To whom it may concern,

Currently the state of Alaska is experiencing a shortage of dall sheep. Majority of game management units within this state have seen drastically reduced sheep populations, with the exception of a few small areas. This population decline has led to a reduction in the amount of full curl rams available for harvest. In addition to this, Alaska has the highest non-resident harvest rate for wild sheep nationwide. The statewide harvest of dall sheep (average for last five years) is currently 45%. Additionally, most federal lands in Alaska regulate the harvest of sheep by guided non-resident hunters while state lands currently offer unlimited non-resident harvest opportunities for dall sheep. As a result of this the harvest rates for non-residents are actually much higher than 45% within Alaska state lands. For example, in unit 19C the non-resident take comprises 75% of the entire dall sheep harvest. This has resulted in Alaska residents avoiding hunting on state lands to seek areas (federal lands) where guided non-resident sheep hunters are limited and harvest levels are more aligned with nationwide levels. This has resulted in the majority of Alaska residents becoming dissatisfied with current management and hunting of dall sheep in Alaska. As a result of this, it is time for the board to impose restrictions upon non-resident dall sheep harvest in Alaska.

Alaska residents are guaranteed by the state constitution for preference when it comes to the allocation of this states fish and game resources. To let non-resident harvest rates approach 45% statewide, with a drastically higher percentages on state lands is completely unacceptable. The vast majority of Alaska residents have shown they desire non-resident sheep harvest levels be reduced. This has been expressed both in resident testimony at board of game meetings and additionally within the recently completed statewide sheep hunter survey. It goes completely against the Alaska state constitution and the expressed majority opinion of Alaska residents for the board to consider reducing resident dall sheep hunting opportunity while non-resident dall sheep harvest rates remain at current levels.

It is my opinion that the board of game should not implement any restrictions upon Alaska resident dall sheep hunting opportunity or aircraft use for dall sheep hunting, Without first reducing the non-resident harvest of dall sheep to 10% of the total take. By imposing a maximum non-resident harvest rate of 25% for dall sheep statewide, the board would eliminate current crowding problems (which occur directly from high non-resident harvest rates). Additionally, I believe the state should impose a mandatory limit of two clients (maximum) in the field at a time for all master and registered guides while hunting sheep. This would spread the non-resident harvest out over a greater period of time and thereby eliminate some of the current crowding problems associated with sheep hunting.

By reducing the non-resident harvest and restricting guides to two clients in the field, the board would uphold that which is mandated in the Alaska constitution (resident resource preference) and support the wishes of Alaska residents. Additionally, these measures would also protect Alaskas declining dall sheep population. The majority of states nationwide limit non-resident sheep harvest to around 10%. To ask that Alaska finally manage it's sheep in a manner consistent with how other states manage their game populations is a fair and balanced approach to addressing the current problems associated with dall sheep and dall sheep hunting in Alaska.

Sincerely,

Luke Graham



Submitted By  
Colt Foster  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 1:44:30 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
303-519-0718

Email  
[flashfoster@hotmail.com](mailto:flashfoster@hotmail.com)

Address  
20633 Philadelphia Way  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

I oppose proposal #207 and hope it is not passed. I am a life long AK resident born and raised here in the Wasilla area and have hunted sheep since I was 8 years old (now 32). Although I have seen many changes in sheep hunting and population dynamics over those years, I do not see current airplane restrictions to be a problem area. Yes there are individuals that abuse the same-day-airborne rules and harass sheep with their airplanes, but no further laws or restrictions will change this. Enforcement of current laws are the only way to combat these violations. The people that break the laws will continue to do so, and the only people this proposal will affect are those honest hunters that are doing things ethically now. My other concern is as a father of two small children that will soon be sheep hunting. Placing time limits and distance limits on airplane use will make it very difficult to take any children or young adults hunting on the weekends without missing school. They are the future of hunting and wildlife management. We are killing our traditions and lifestyle if we are unable to get the next generation involved because time simply does not allow for landing at a strip, hiking in somewhere and hunting, and then packing a ram out.

I urge the board to fail this proposal based on sound rationale instead of listening to emotional testimony from a few individuals that are hoping to limit airplane usage for their own sheep hunting advantage.



Submitted By  
Colt Foster  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 4:00:55 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
303-519-0718

Email  
[flashfoster@hotmail.com](mailto:flashfoster@hotmail.com)

Address  
20633 Philadelphia Way  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

I would like to comment on proposal #208. I am a lifelong AK resident born and raised in the Wasilla area and have hunted sheep almost every season for the last 25 years. Sheep hunting is my passion and the main reason I returned to AK after dental school. Although I still dream about opening day of the season all year, I have noticed some major negative changes in sheep hunting over the last few years. The last 5-10 years I have had more negative interactions with guides and fellow resident hunters than ever before. I believe this is due to more hunting pressure in the harvest ticket areas because more areas have gone to drawing and fewer tags given out. I also believe the number and quality of rams has decreased in the OTC harvest ticket areas. Simply put, we have fewer areas to hunt sheep and fewer quality rams to hunt. This has caused many guide operations to become VERY territorial and harrass resident hunters to make it less likely to have competition. This concentrates the resident hunters even further as we try to stay away from bad hunting experiences. I have been confronted by guiding operations on the ground to the point that you worry whether or not your tent or airplane will be there when you get back. Others in my hunting group have witnessed guide airplanes herding sheep towards their non-resident hunters on the ground. This is NOT the way sheep hunting is supposed to be.

I agree that changes need to be made and I commend the board for taking a long look at these options. I am very much in favor of limiting the number of non-resident hunters and next-of-kin hunters. We as residents pay the higher living costs and suffer through long dark winters for the privelege to hunt in this great state. Let's keep it in favor of the residents. I understand there is much political pressure about this issue and money becomes a factor. I am very much willing to increase cost per resident sheep tag to help offset the loss of state revenue. I just do not feel limiting residents or making specific time periods for hunting does anything except help the guide industry. And many of these guides that those changes would help are not even state residents. I don't see how that helps the state in any way.

Thank you for your effort to improve sheep hunting in AK.



Submitted By  
Mark Luttrell  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 4:09:04 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907 224-5372  
Email  
[prufrock@arctic.net](mailto:prufrock@arctic.net)  
Address  
Box 511  
Seward, Alaska 99664

I fully **support proposal 170** that may help brown bear numbers increase on the Kenai Peninsula. I completely trust the science driven expertise of the USFWS.



Submitted By  
Mark Luttrell  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 4:04:33 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907 224-5372  
Email  
[prufrock@arctic.net](mailto:prufrock@arctic.net)  
Address  
Box 511  
Seward, Alaska 99664

I fully **support** proposals **180 and 181** that help create safer trails for recreational users in Cooper Landing and the eastern Kenai Peninsula.

These similar proposals seek to create legally enforceable, easily identified areas that are small but free of traps. They do not attempt to restrict trapping in general. They represent a sane and well-reasoned improvement to existing conditions.

If these proposals do not pass, user conflict will grow.

The Seward Advisory Committee might have supported proposal 181 if they had realized that dogs are not required to be on leashes on KPB, State Parks, State DNR and USFS land except at developed public facilities (USFS and Parks only) like trailheads and cabins. Dogs can legally run free on trails.

Submitted By  
Bruce Graham  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 5:16:27 PM  
Affiliation



PC181  
1 of 1

I was disappointed that the board of game chose not to take any action regarding the dall sheep proposals. Clearly, the state of Alaska is out of step with the rest of the country and Canada when it comes to regulating the harvest of wild sheep. Our state constitution mandates that Alaska's natural resources are to be managed for the maximum benefit of Alaska residents, this does not seem to be happening with our sheep harvest. As I understand it, there is currently no limit to the number of sheep which are subject to harvest by non residents, this needs to be modified as it is not congruent with our state constitutional mandate.



Submitted By  
Stefanie  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 6:30:42 PM  
Affiliation



PC182  
1 of 1

**I SUPPORT Board Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area.** Because trails are multi-use, efforts must be made for the safety of those using trails and roads. A 250 foot "safety zone" along roads and trails is necessary and reasonable to protect people and pets. This proposal does not prohibit one use over the other but instead allows everyone to safely access these places knowing where it is free of traps and where traps may be placed.



Submitted By  
Dave Sullivan  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 10:45:39 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072449074

Email  
[wrdave1@gmail.com](mailto:wrdave1@gmail.com)

Address  
6748 Delong Landing Cir.  
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Restricting aircraft use in sheep hunting is totally unrealistic and unfair. Many people that love to hunt sheep, and go after only old, trophy sheep, don't have 20, 30, 40 or even 50-year old legs, and an airplane that they've flown for many years for the main purpose of hunting sheep is their only way to pursue their passion. Plus, this law would be extremely difficult to enforce, and would also open many opportunities for hunters and guides to make false reports of people violating the law!



Submitted By  
Dave Sullivan  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 10:52:31 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072449074

Email  
[wrdave1@gmail.com](mailto:wrdave1@gmail.com)

Address  
6748 Delong Landing Cir.  
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

#208-SHEEP HUNTING. The proposal to limit resident sheep hunters to time-slots is totally unrealistic. There is no way a non-resident should have unlimited hunting opportunities while limiting residents to hunt periods based on their last name (or whatever). People that live in this state should have first priority on ALL of the resources of this state.



Submitted By  
Marilyn Houser  
Submitted On  
2/25/2015 10:16:43 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072782122

Email  
[lostinspace@matnet.com](mailto:lostinspace@matnet.com)

Address  
2411 Ingra Street  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

~~I oppose proposal 150 which seeks to establish an antlerless moose hunt in Kincaid Park. I have been a user of the park since 1980 and have never had any negative encounters with moose, not even cows with calves. I ski, hike, bird watch, walk my leashed dogs, and ride my bike there. I like seeing moose in the park and use common sense when I am on the trails, giving moose a wide berth or changing my route if necessary. Kincaid Park would have to be closed for the 2-3 duration of a hunt for public safety; many different users of the park would be displaced for the benefit of 10 hunters. Kincaid Park is a public park, not a private hunting reserve.



Submitted By  
Lesamiller  
Submitted On  
2/25/2015 9:37:27 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
703-587-7389  
Email  
[lesamiller@hotmail.com](mailto:lesamiller@hotmail.com)  
Address  
12400 Ventura Blvd #793  
Studio City, California 19604

Dear ABG,

Regarding Proposal 150: I urge you to **vote "No"** on the moose hunt in Kincaid Park in Anchorage.

Regarding Proposal 170: I urge you to **vote "Yes"** for putting strict limitations on brown bear hunting.

Regarding Proposals 180 & 181: I urge you to **vote "Yes"** for trapping restrictions of brown bears in Kenai Peninsula.

As a former hunter myself, I wish to submit brief comments pertaining to both hunting and trapping of brown bears: According to stats, brown bear numbers have dropped significantly, especially females needed for reproducing & maintaining a healthy, diverse population. Human interaction is the major reason for their decline, so killing bears is not the answer for ecological or ethical reasons!! To the contrary. Educating the public with widespread publicity campaigns (social media platforms, public forums, school programs, media coverage) about preventing bear-human conflict is key to keeping people & bears alive. The eco-tourist industry, healthy brown bear population, and your work ethic/reputation all factor into making the right decision on behalf of all the players. Furthermore, trapping is indiscriminant and is a barbaric method of killing any animal.

As for hunting moose in the park, I oppose it because I believe people must learn to live with/tolerate their local wildlife. If people are occasionally inconvenienced by wild animals when they step into what is considered the only home they have, then so be it. Eco-tourists such as myself would very much enjoy seeing moose and other native wildlife while visiting Kincaid Park. Selling hunting licenses to people who want to bragging rights about large game they kill is hardly my idea of proper or scientifically sound wildlife management.

Thank you for your consideration and please do what is right by the wildlife in your state. If you don't, no one else will.

Sincerely,

Lesamiller

Submitted By  
Kris Malecha  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 8:51:29 AM  
Affiliation



PC186  
1 of 1

All...while I, too, echo the words in the following comment...I'll add my two cents. As a trail user, and runner, having a dog with me keeps me safe from other predators and animals in the area. Leashing him on a narrow, rooted trail is often less safe than allowing him to run ahead of me (he likes to be "first"). In the event he might wander, the thought of losing him to a trap set too close to the trail is horrifying. I'm sure as likely pet owners you can relate. But NOT having a dog along, in bear country, can also be unwise. So for that reason I support the following comments too, and urge you to create the 250-foot corridor. Thank you!

**I SUPPORT Board Game Proposal 180 - Cooper Landing Area.** Because trails are multi-use, efforts must be made for the safety of those using trails and roads. A 250 foot "safety zone" along roads and trails is necessary and reasonable to protect people and pets. This proposal does not prohibit one use over the other but instead allows everyone to safely access these places knowing where it is free of traps and where traps may be placed.



Submitted By  
John Campbell  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 4:58:19 PM  
Affiliation  
Self

27 February 2015

Alaska Board of Game,

I would like the board to consider and vote yes in favor of proposals that encourage the "hunting" of sheep rather than the "killing" of sheep. I would also encourage the board to give residents preference where there is more demand than the resource can support (i.e. all draw hunts and some of the more heavily hunted sheep areas such as unit 20).

Sheep are not a subsistence/meat pursuit but rather a trophy species for almost all of the people that pursue them. Unfortunately, this has led to a culture of people wanting to kill rams to put on pictures on Facebook and trophies on their walls. Although some want the experience of sheep hunting and killing a ram is the cherry on top, unfortunately, they are a small minority. I think there are some good proposals put forth by the board that will get us back to "hunting" sheep rather than just "killing" them.

**Proposal 207-I support options #1 and #3:** I feel that aircraft use is out of hand and should only be used for transporting hunters, not finding game for them. Using aircraft to spot sheep gives a person a huge advantage and at a time when most indications point to a resource in decline, we should not allow an activity that allows someone to be much more successful, not to mention is considered unsportsman like by many people.

The arguments I hear against this is that it is not enforceable; I need to circle to check on landing spots, etc. However, I think it can be enforced to some degree. Yes people are going to violate it and not get caught, but if we took away every law/regulation we couldn't enforce easily and catch folks in the act all the time we would have next to no laws on the books. A regulation is needed so that when someone is caught they have to pay the consequences. Most hunters I know have a camera with a video option that can be used to record illegal activity and turn over to the troopers. Also, most pilots use a GPS and their tracks can be looked at to see if they were circling sheep or realistic landing spots. From my understanding this isn't much different than some of the same day airborne investigations.

Use of aircraft also allows people to access better areas and allows them a much better chance at spotting any sheep in the area, even as they fly in. We need to give sheep a chance to disperse and move around so that they can't be spotted the day before, sat on overnight, and then killed at 03:00 the next day. Part of sheep hunting is hiking around hoping to find a legal/large ram, not knowing where one is then going straight to where he was last seen trying to find a predetermined target.

Sheep aren't a cryptic species and if you know the general area they were, unless they moved a long distance, it is hard for them to hide from spotting scopes and binoculars if you know where to start looking. I would like that a person has to be on the ground at least one full day (00:01-23:59) before they can harvest an animal. This would give the sheep more time to move around. I hear arguments that guys can't do weekend hunts with this, but I think if people want to kill a sheep they need to make having an actual hunt more of a priority than killing sheep and trying to get out of the field in one or two days. There are many places across the state they can go to where they can start hunting sheep the moment they leave their vehicle; it just may not be as easy. If they want to use a plane and really want to hunt for a ram they may have to work harder and dedicate more time to harvesting that animal. We shouldn't cater to folks and make things easier because they have tight schedules and want to kill sheep instead of spending time on the ground hunting them. Let's remember that it's called sheep hunting, not sheep shooting.

**Proposal 208-I support options #2 for Non-Residents and option #4 for Residents, oppose option #5 for Residents:** There is a lot of evidence pointing to crowding and/or quality of hunt issue and we need to figure out how to spread hunters out over the course of a season. I believe these options do a very good job of that. It also makes resident hunters chose what type of hunt/experience they want, and still allows everyone (residents and non-residents) the option to hunt sheep every year if they want. I hear people mention weather and/or they may be moose or caribou hunting late August into September, but this is Alaska and people hunt across this whole state well into September every year and will have to make decisions on what they want to hunt. These options give us the both of best worlds-

chances at a less crowded hunt, but still a guarantee that we can still hunt sheep if we want. I think Non-resid similar system with a cap (10%) on the early season draws/registrations.



PC187  
2 of 2

**Proposal 153 and 154-OPPOSE!!**-I adamantly oppose these two proposals as they serve as nothing but to promote the guide industry. These are all highly sought after tags by residents for lots of reasons, and to designate them for guided hunters only (or Non-Residents in general) is asinine. These resources have much more demand than they can support (hence why they are on a drawing permit) and when a resource is limited I believe that residents should be given priority. If there needs to be more hunter participation, increase the tags to give everyone a better chance at getting one and harvesting those animals. Otherwise we create situations like Kodiak where guided non-residents have much better odds at getting a tag than residents which is just plain wrong in my opinion.

If Non-Residents must be allocated tags, I can't imagine putting a guide requirement on them. I would much rather see a non-resident father, daughter, son, etc. of a resident get those tags and have an opportunity at a hunt they probably couldn't afford otherwise and experience it with an Alaskan relative. Securing clients for guides is not the Board's responsibility, as there are millions of acres of harvest ticket/registration areas across Alaska that is at the guide's disposal. It should be up to the guide to provide a hunting experience that people want to sign up for, not be forced into using one. If someone draws a tag and wants to use a guide I have no problem with it, but taking away opportunity because they don't want to/can't afford a guide is ridiculous.

I thank the Board for taking the time to consider my comments. As you make decisions about these and other proposals, please remember that there is a big difference between hunting and killing. Also keep in mind that opportunities and a resident's access to a state resource should take priority over dollars and non-resident opportunity.

Sincerely,

JOHN CAMPBELL



Submitted By  
Mark Stiller  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 5:40:25 PM  
Affiliation



PC188  
1 of 1

To Board of Game,

I am writing you today to express why I hope you **do NOT** pass proposition 207 and 208, mainly because they both will make the citizens of the state of Alaska suffer! Please do not pass them.

First a little of why I'm qualified to speak on the issue.....

I'm Alaska resident since 1976. I have hunted moose, deer, caribou and sheep almost all the years I have lived here.

I own a super cub and fly a minimum of 45-50 hours every fall looking for good spots to hunt. With my girls in middle school and high school, most of our trips are long weekend trips only. If the "48 hour rule as stated in prop 208 passes, I will not be able to take these trips with my girls. The current allotted wait time is very ample! I use the plane as a tool to spot game, yes but I do it in a responsible way like all of my flying friends. We do not push or harass game. Many times I have seen a camp in the valley floor below and leave the area, knowing someone else is already there.

The following are just a few reasons I do not support props. 207 and 208:

207- unfairly targets the hard working people who live and work here, ALASKANS.

It would limit the time I could spend with family hunting long weekends! "48 hours"

It is not fair to target a small user group, plane owners, and make them and them only suffer.

208- limits the time residents can spend in the field pursuing sheep! That is just wrong!

We all know weather in Ak changes things. If I have to choose a time period to hunt in it may not work out weather wise. Or if I don't find a big ram the first hunt I'm done for the year.

I do not shoot a ram every year, I look for big, old sheep. I have harvested 5 dall sheep. I have gone on at least one sheep hunt a year for as long as I can remember, sometimes three or four trips a year!

I believe that both of these propositions put restrictions only on Alaskan residents and specifically residents with planes. That is wrong. The State Constitution states the resources of Alaska are to be managed for the citizens of the State FIRST! Please do the right thing and table propositions 207 and 208 until next year. Set up working groups to tackle the issue and hammer out common sense restrictions. The biggest problems are, predator contro for sheep predators (coyote), non resident guides in the field for sheep, (I have heard about 75% of the guides in the field, guiding sheep hunters, are non residents!), the number of guides period for sheep especially is totally out of control. The skew tan river drainage alone has at least 5 or 6 guide camps, it has decimated what was already a low sheep number area! Finally, we need to consider limiting the number of sheep hunters each guide can take out every year! Some guides literally take as many sheep as they can out of an area then move on to the next.

Please make the right decision for Alaskan residents!

Mark Stiller



Submitted By  
JoeRay Skrha  
Submitted On  
2/25/2015 10:15:44 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
(907) 283-6100  
Email  
[joeray@alaska.net](mailto:joeray@alaska.net)  
Address  
2455 Watergate Way  
Kenai, Alaska 99611

My name is Joe Ray Skrha and I am a 35 year resident of the State of Alaska residing mile 3 Kenai River. I am writing you to stop killing brown bear. Because these brown bears are an isolated population, have low reproductive potential and are difficult to monitor (population studies in heavily forested regions are extremely difficult and expensive), brown bear management on the Kenai requires a very conservative approach.

The 2013 and 2014 mortality rates for female bears are alarming, and clearly unsustainable. If the state's liberal harvest quotas for sport hunters remain in effect, the area's bear population will decline to a point where neither hunters nor non-consumptive users will be able to spot bears. Notwithstanding recent years' excessive mortality rates, the population was already at a low density compared to other costal brown bear populations. Continued decline will result in substantial long-term damage to the Peninsula's ecosystems.

The USF&WS proposal includes stricter harvest limits in the Kenai's "back country". These are the most easily viewed bears - those that live closest to areas easily accessible to visitors, photographers and wildlife watchers. Continued substantial population losses among these bears will be a loss for the area's tourism industry. Any continued decline in the Kenai brown bear population is inconsistent with USF&WS's legal mandates, which include ensuring opportunities for non-consumptive users who value and enjoy wildlife for activities.

Sincerely,

Joe Ray Skrha,

Attorney at Law



Submitted By  
Jake Jacobson  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 8:13:23 AM  
Affiliation  
Resident of Alaska

Phone  
907 486 5253  
Email  
[hunfish@ak.net](mailto:hunfish@ak.net)  
Address  
POBox 1313  
Kodiak, Alaska 99615

Regarding the WAH Caribou herd. Regulations for GMU23 & GMU 26A West.

Season: August 1 through October 7 (close during rut) and Nov.1-Dec.31 Bull Caribou only.

Bag limit: Residents: 2 Bull Caribou/year

Non Residents: 2 Bull Caribou/year

Work to set Federal Subsistence Season: August 1 through October 7 (close during rut) and Nov.1-Dec.31 Bull Caribou only.

Work to reduce Federal Subsistence bag limits from 5 Caribou/day to 5 Bull Caribou/year

Work to reduce Federal Subsistence bag limits for residents of GMU 23 & GMU 26A West from 15 Caribou per day to 5 Bull Caribou/year.

Submitted By  
Greg Waisanen  
Submitted On  
2/26/2015 8:09:12 AM  
Affiliation



PC191  
1 of 1

the proposal to limit use of aircraft to scout sheep will only hurt the resident hunters. With so many guides in the mountians and many of them placing multiple camps no matter if they are using them or not it sometimes takes a great effort and amount of flying before a resident hunter can even find an unoccupied area to hunt let alone one with a legal ram in it. This regulation targets resident hunters only as the guides will be able to continue to scout for sheep while moving clients and gear with air planes between already established camps. The better proposal to help return the sheep poulation to what it was would be to limit the # of non-resident hunters a guide can take during a season and limit the # of camps he can place in any one use area.

Submitted By  
Greg Pepperd  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 5:39:06 PM  
Affiliation  
None



PC192  
1 of 1

Proposal # 207 is grossly unfair to many resident sheep hunters. It sounds more like a case of "have nots" trying to penalize "haves" in regard to aircraft. It would be more productive to concentrate on issues that would increase sheep populations such as predator control.

Submitted By  
Darcy Davis  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 11:10:49 PM  
Affiliation



PC193  
1 of 1

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on Ira Edward's proposal for a limited moose hunt in Kincaid Park for disabled persons (proposition #150).

I support Proposition #150. I feel the numbers of moose in Kincaid Park present a serious risk to park users. As an Anchorage resident for over 30 years I have been witness to a huge expansion of recreational use of Kincaid Park. The addition of soccer fields, biathlon range, disk golf course and singletrack trails have brought thousands of people to the park who never used to recreate there. I think this is a wonderful thing. Kincaid is a thriving park. People love to go there, both summer and winter.

The Municipality of Anchorage takes pride in Kincaid Park and what has been accomplished there. I applaud their efforts and those of the many non-profit agencies who have partnered with them to develop Kincaid fully. But, I feel we have reached a breaking point. Where there used to be small groups of people and a few moose, now there are lots of people and way too many moose. We have reached critical mass and something needs to be done before someone gets killed. Many have been injured. I am one of them. I was trampled by a moose while riding my bike in Kincaid Park two summers ago. I am lucky to have escaped without serious injuries.

We need to prioritize public use of the park over allowing for the proliferation of the moose population there. I spoke to numerous people in public office, fish and game authorities and municipal employees after I was trampled by the moose. Jesse Coltrane told me two years ago that she would not oppose a moose hunt in Kincaid. Chris Birch told me to imagine Anchorage was New York City, and Kincaid was Central Park. He asked me to imagine the conflict of humans vs moose! I feel we have reached a population density that will no longer allow for safe use of the park.

Please be proactive and work towards a solution of limiting the numbers of moose at Kincaid Park. I hope it will not take someone getting killed there for authorities to take serious action on this issue. Thank you for your time and consideration.



Submitted By  
Dan Montgomery  
Submitted On  
2/27/2015 4:59:00 PM  
Affiliation

Thank you Board of Game members for considering my comments on these proposals. I know it has been a very busy year for the board members and staff and I appreciate all of the time and effort you put into this.

Proposal 151: Support Changing these hunts to any ram is necessary with a decline of 50% of our sheep population in the past 15 years. Every ewe is important.

Proposal 152: Oppose There is a very limited number of non-resident permits in this area and the current managing strategy is working very well and should stay in place.

Proposal 153 Support There has been a growing number of non-resident next of kin hunters applying for these hunts and putting a cap on the number they can draw is necessary to sustain a viable guiding opportunity in the future. If the board adopts this proposal please take the rifle permit out of DS230, DS231, DS232, DS236, DS237 or DS238 and take the archery permit from DS 240. If you do this it will maintain a guiding opportunity in every hunt area in the park every year. Thank you.

Proposal 154: Support

Creating these Mt. goat hunts will bring money into the state and generate a guiding opportunity that doesn't really exist now because there is so many resident applicants. I believe there should be 2 permits issued for each hunt. These Mt. goat populations are very under harvested and I think the Dept. of Fish and Game could issue 2 or 3 times the permits in these areas without going over their harvest goal of 6% of the population.

Proposal 208: Oppose

I think the board is working in the right direction with this proposal but should make every effort to find a solution to the crowding problem with going to draw permits.