



Submitted by: Brian Watkins

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Eagle River, AK

Comment:

I put these proposals in as primitive weapons. Its come to my attention that Alaska doesnt define primitive weapons. I would like for an any weapon hunt, but If it helps the proposal pass, bow or shotgun can be submitted (proposal 90, 97,98)

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 90: Support Proposal 97: Support Proposal 98: Support Proposal 204: Oppose

I am the proposer of this proposal. I wanted to make it clear that my intention was not to add any tags. DS141 already has 24 tags. I would like to separate those tags into (2) 12 tag allocations. This will alleviate over-pressure of sheep during the hunt, as well as allow for a hunt that is prior to the neighboring Hunter creek rifle draw. This will allow for a more hunter-friendly experience. A lot of hunter creek tag hunters access the area through DS141 and it pressures the sheep prior to the opener of a bow only tag

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 84: Support

I am opposing Proposal 82. The area of the east fork of the ekultna drainage is one of very few areas that is bow only for sheep. DS141 is already extremely heavy on hunters at tags of 24. DS124 is also prior to the DS141 season, which would push sheep out of the area. I have personally hunted DS141 4 times and each time it is difficult to hunt such a small area with the amount of tags. To put a rifle tag prior to that hunt would take away from DS141 and create pressure and safety issues.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 82: Oppose



Submitted by: Gary Weaver

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, AK

Comment:

Proposal 82 - opposed

Proposal 67, 71, 72, 87, 91, 92, 93, 99, 100, 101, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126 - all support

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 67: Support Proposal 71: Support Proposal 72: Support Proposal 82: Oppose Proposal 87: Support
Proposal 91: Support Proposal 92: Support Proposal 93: Support Proposal 99: Support Proposal 100: Support Proposal
101: Support Proposal 110: Support Proposal 111: Support Proposal 112: Support Proposal 113: Support Proposal
119: Support Proposal 120: Support Proposal 121: Support Proposal 122: Support Proposal 123: Support Proposal 124:
Support Proposal 125: Support Proposal 126: Support



Submitted by: Jared Webber

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Alaska, Alaska

Comment:

Yes

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Oppose Proposal 146: Oppose Proposal 147: Oppose Proposal 148: Oppose Proposal 149: Oppose Proposal
150: Oppose Proposal 151: Oppose Proposal 152: Oppose Proposal 153: Oppose Proposal 154: Oppose



I support the following proposal(s) that have been submitted by the Cooper Landing Safe Trails Committee to the Alaska Board of Game to reduce conflicts with trappers and increase safety among the rising number of multi-use groups in Game Unit 7 (the Cooper Landing area). I believe the proposed are reasonable setbacks to maintain safe recreation for trail users and their pets.

There are multiple proposals for trap setbacks or trap signage in the Cooper Landing area.

Please select the proposals that you are in support of (select all that apply).

If there is more than one person in your household, please have each person submit their comments separately. You can copy this, or contact cooperlandingsafetrails@gmail.com for extra forms.

- # 145 Wildlife Crossings:** ¼ mile hunting and trapping buffers from mouths of new highway wildlife crossings on the upcoming Cooper Landing bypass
- #149 Campgrounds:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along the perimeter of the Quartz Creek, Crescent Creek, Russian River, and Cooper Creek (North and South) campgrounds, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
- # 150 Roads and pullouts:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along both sides of roads and all sides of the the pullouts listed: Quartz Creek Road, East Quartz Creek and Williams Road, Old Sterling Highway, Snug Harbor Road, Bean Creek Road, Russian Gap Road, and all pullouts along the Sterling Highway. AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
- #151 Summit Recreation:** Establish trapping setbacks along the perimeter of all highway pullouts, backcountry access points, and winter trails in the Japan Woods area, Tenderfoot Campground ski area, Park-N-Poke area, and Manitoba Mountain.
- #152 Trails:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along both sides of the trails and all sides of the following trailheads: Crescent Creek Trail, Lower Russian Lake Trail, Bean Creek Trail, Russian Gap Trail/Historic Quartz Creek Trail, Resurrection Trail (South End), West Juneau Bench Trail, Devil's Pass Ski Loops, and Stetson Creek Parking area and Trail, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
- #153 Beaches:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback from the mean high-water mark along the north and south side beaches of Kenai Lake, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
- # 154 Signage:** Establishing mandatory signs posted at all access points of active trapping in the Game Unit 7 area to reduce conflicts with trappers and increase safety among the rising number of multi-use groups.

Other areas setback proposals:

- #146 Trails in Kachemak Bay State Park:** Establish 100 yard trapping setback from the Diamond Creek Trail, the Grewingk Saddle Trail.
- #147 Ski Trails in Homer:** Establish 100 yard setback from the Snowmad Trails and the Kachemak Nordic Ski Club Trails
- # 148 Seward Trails:** Establish a 100 yard trapping setback from trails in Seward.

Comments:



PC 354

MY PROPERTY BORDERS A MAJOR
 TRAIL IN COOPER LANDING. I ALWAYS
 HAVE CONCERNS WHEN MY PETS ARE AROUND
 THAT BORDER. I SHOULD NOT HAVE TO
 FEAR FOR MY OWN PETS.

(feel free to add extra pages of comments)

Printed Name (First and last)*: HARVEY P. WEBER II

Organization (if any) SELF

Signature*: Harvey P. Weber II

Email*: [Redacted]

Street Address [Redacted]

City*: COOPER LANDING State*: AK Zip code: 99572

*Indicates it must be filled in to be accepted.

Cooper Landing Trap Setback Proposals, Comments & Ballot



PC 355

I support the following proposal(s) that have been submitted by the Cooper Landing Safe Trails Committee to the Alaska Board of Game to reduce conflicts with trappers and increase safety among the rising number of multi-use groups in Game Unit 7 (the Cooper Landing area). I believe the proposed are reasonable setbacks to maintain safe recreation for trail users and their pets.

There are multiple proposals for trap setbacks or trap signage in the Cooper Landing area.

Please select the proposals that you are in support of (select all that apply).

If there is more than one person in your household, please have each person submit their comments separately. You can copy this, or contact cooperlandingsafetrails@gmail.com for extra forms.

*From: Linn & Mary Weeda, 3529 [REDACTED] Anchorage, AK
99517*

- # 145 Wildlife Crossings:** ¼ mile hunting and trapping buffers from mouths of new highway wildlife crossings on the upcoming Cooper Landing bypass
 - #149 Campgrounds:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along the perimeter of the Quartz Creek, Crescent Creek, Russian River, and Cooper Creek (North and South) campgrounds, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
 - # 150 Roads and pullouts:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along both sides of roads and all sides of the the pullouts listed: Quartz Creek Road, East Quartz Creek and Williams Road, Old Sterling Highway, Snug Harbor Road, Bean Creek Road, Russian Gap Road, and all pullouts along the Sterling Highway. AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
 - #151 Summit Recreation:** Establish trapping setbacks along the perimeter of all highway pullouts, backcountry access points, and winter trails in the Japan Woods area, Tenderfoot Campground ski area, Park-N-Poke area, and Manitoba Mountain.
 - #152 Trails:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback along both sides of the trails and all sides of the following trailheads: Crescent Creek Trail, Lower Russian Lake Trail, Bean Creek Trail, Russian Gap Trail/Historic Quartz Creek Trail, Resurrection Trail (South End), West Juneau Bench Trail, Devil's Pass Ski Loops, and Stefson Creek Parking area and Trail, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
 - #153 Beaches:** Establish 1) a 100-yard trapping setback from the mean high-water mark along the north and south side beaches of Kenai Lake, AND 2) a 50-yard trapping setback for traps with an inside spread of 5 inches or less, that are set at least 4 feet above the ground or snow level, and size 3 leghold marten traps set in boxes.
 - # 154 Signage:** Establishing mandatory signs posted at all access points of active trapping in the Game Unit 7 area to reduce conflicts with trappers and increase safety among the rising number of multi-use groups.
- Other areas setback proposals:**
- #146 Trails in Kachemak Bay State Park:** Establish 100 yard trapping setback from the Diamond Creek Trail, the Grewingk Saddle Trail.
 - #147 Ski Trails in Homer:** Establish 100 yard setback from the Snowmad Trails and the Kachemak Nordic Ski Club Trails
 - # 148 Seward Trails:** Establish a 100 yard trapping setback from trails in Seward.



Comments to Board of Game Southcentral Region Proposals, Spring 2023

Comments submitted by: Brian West

[REDACTED]
Anchorage, Alaska 99515

Proposal 55. OPPOSE. This makes no sense. Why should the State reduce the number of resident permits just to add non-resident permits?

Proposal 58. OPPOSE. Serves no purpose. The proposer indicates that he is concerned that novice hunters will take too many female goats. However, the taking of females, without kids, is allowed in all units open to goat hunting.

Proposal 59. OPPOSE. Nothing prohibits the use of archery equipment during the existing hunt. This proposal would discriminate against one group of hunters for the benefit of another.

Proposal 60. OPPOSE. This proposal seeks to eliminate the use of rifles in this hunt for the benefit of those who use archery equipment. The proposer is able to hunt with bow and arrow during the general season.

Proposal 61. OPPOSE. If the deer population can sustain the harvest I see no reason to reduce the bag limit because someone does not believe another does not need 5 deer. How could he possibly know the needs of other people?

Proposal 63. SUPPORT

Proposal 66. OPPOSE. Nothing restricts the use of archery equipment during the hunt. Contrary to the proposer's statement this proposal would decrease the opportunity of all those who do not use bow and arrow. This is a self-serving proposal to allow archery only hunting in the areas most popular with other hunters and with easier access.

Proposal 67. OPPOSE. Why should one group of hunters lose opportunity for the benefit of another? This person should put in for the earlier hunt and hunt with a bow if he so chooses.

Proposal 69. SUPPORT.

Proposal 71. OPPOSE. There is no restriction on using archery equipment during the regular hunt. A special hunt is not required. If as stated, this will allow bow hunters to be in the field without the expectation of taking an animal maybe they should consider camping. Additionally, if they have no expectation of killing an animal why should the State go through the added expense of administering this special hunt?

Proposal 72. OPPOSE.

Proposal 73. OPPOSE. Instead of reducing the bag limit for residents eliminate the non-resident hunt.

Proposal 75. OPPOSE. This would be virtually impossible to enforce.

Proposal 77. SUPPORT

Proposal 78. SUPPORT

Proposal 79. SUPPORT. There should never be non-resident opportunity when resident opportunity is restricted to a permit. The State is not responsible for providing a client base to guides.

Proposal 84, 85. OPPOSE. There is no reason for a special bow only hunt. Few permits are given and the proposers should apply for these permits and hunt with a bow if successful. What they are really looking for is a way of increasing their odds of getting a permit.

Proposal 87. OPPOSE. There is no restriction on using a bow during the general season. This is a lightly hunted area with little competition. Why should a special season be created just because it is harder for bow hunters to take game. This seems to be the only reason given for establishing this hunt.

Proposal 88. OPPOSE. This proposer states that this change would eliminate hunting opportunity for others. However, that is exactly what it does. It eliminates rifle hunting and replaces it with bow only. Also, how does the proposer make the leap from remoteness to ethical hunting? As stated before nothing in the regulations prohibits the use of archery equipment during the existing hunt.

Proposal 90. SUPPORT with conditions. I would support this if it was an any weapon hunt.

Proposal 91. OPPOSE. Too high of a risk of wounded bears with bow only in a populated area.

Proposal 92. OPPOSE. Too high of a risk of a wounded bear in a popular recreation area. One wounded bear causing problems would shut down hunts in this area no matter the weapon. One only has to remember the problems associated with the archery only hunt for moose on the Anchorage hillside years ago to see how this is a bad idea.

Proposal 93, 94, 95, 96. OPPOSE.

Proposal 97. SUPPORT

Proposal 101. OPPOSE. Why should the State expend time and money for a hunt that has almost no chance of success, as stated by the proposer?

Proposal 102. SUPPORT

Proposal 106. OPPOSE. This hunt is open to ATV during the majority of the season which lasts from Sep 1 through Sept 25. Only two four day periods are closed to ATV, this gives those without ATV an opportunity to hunt without being harassed by them. If someone wants to hunt with unrestricted ATV use there are literally millions of acres in the State open to them.

Proposal 107. OPPOSE. Being disabled, veteran or not, does not entitle a person to special exemptions to the detriment of others. This area is open to ATV use for the majority of the season so his access is not eliminated. This is merely a veiled attempt to increase the success of one group at the expense of others. If this person wants to hunt in areas without ATV restrictions there are millions of acres in the State open to him.

Proposal 110, 111, 112, 113. OPPOSE. With so few hunters there should be no conflict with others if people were to hunt with a bow during the general season.

Proposal 114. OPPOSE. The existing hunt is open to all hunters, why should one group be eliminated for the benefit of another?

Proposal 119, 120. OPPOSE. Likely to be unsuccessful but would impact the success rate of the general hunt by spooking the animals.

Proposal 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126. OPPOSE

Proposal 127. OPPOSE. Proposer states that poor weather is the reason for implementing this change. However, the proposed season in early Nov. is the stormiest month in that region. If harvest numbers are decreasing as stated extending the season into the rut would not be a good for the health of the moose population.

Proposal 133. OPPOSE. I fail to see how they can be confused with the regulations in Unit 6 and 15 being different. The wording is quite clear. You can not even make the argument that they are adjacent Units as they are separated by Unit 7.



Submitted by: Stephen Stringham

Organization Name: WildWatch Consulting

Community of Residence: Soldotna, AK

Comment:

BOG Should Heed ADF&G Biologists

Unlike human rules, Natural laws can't be broken. They can't even be bent. But they can be used to our advantage – once we learn them, which is best done through science. Yet all too often, as illustrated by the recent Covid crisis, scientists who dare contradict politically correct dogma are all too often muzzled.

This also happens in wildlife management. Intensive Management assumes that the number of moose and caribou that can be harvested each year on a sustained yield basis is maximized by keeping their populations near carrying capacity – which isn't true.

The capability of a moose to survive harsh winters, parasites, diseases, and predators can depend on its health and nutritional status. Nutritional status depends on per capita food supply. When moose are scarce, most moose tend to be well fed. As the number of moose increases, malnutrition can occur, increasing vulnerability to harsh winters, parasites, diseases, and predators. Beyond carrying capacity, moose deaths exceed the number of calves being born. A population near carrying capacity is highly vulnerable to any drop in that capacity due to bad weather or competition from other herbivores, which increases vulnerability to weather, parasitism, disease, or predators.

In a population at carrying capacity, moose are a lot more less productive than at an intermediate density – the so-called optimal density. Even if Alaska's Intensive Management legislation can't be revised to replace "carrying capacity" with "optimum density", the BOG should be wise enough to interpret the regulations that way, if the goal really is to maximize harvest. Identifying optimal density takes the skills of professional scientists.

Despit Alaska's bad habit of muzzling State biologists (and ignoring other scientists) who recommend managing according to the best available science, Alaska has an extraordinarily good record of hiring first class scientists – far more so than many other states. On the Kenai Peninsula, we are fortunate to have [REDACTED], who participated in wolf-moose studies in the Lower 48 before coming to Alaska. After serving for decades as Area Manager, he became Regional Coordinator. Replacing him as Area Manager is [REDACTED], an expert on interactions among predator species. We also have Wildlife Physiologist [REDACTED], and Wildlife Biologists [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Where additional expertise is needed, they can turn to Biologist [REDACTED] on Kodiak Island, and to those in Anchorage. Our team of local ADF&G scientists is highly skilled as field biologists as well as thoroughly trained in book knowledge, computing, and other technologies.

Let's hope that when the BOG meets here in mid-March that they refrain from dictating to these biologists and take their expert advice on how best to maximize moose and caribou harvests on the Kenai Peninsula.



Submitted by: Danielle Williams

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Comment:

Alaska Board of Game Members:

I write today to strongly support Proposals 145 - 154.

Thank you in advance for considering my comments below.

-Danielle Williams

I am a 30-year Alaska resident who spends a lot of time on the Kenai - especially in and around Cooper Landing, Seward, Homer and Kachemak Bay - supporting the local economies. My husband and I hike, backpack, camp, fish, canoe, ski and stay at local cabins, etc. - and always with our dogs. We have introduced many a visitor to the Kenai to do the same.

We always go with the hopes of seeing bears, lynx, moose, etc. in the wild – an opportunity so exceedingly rare in our world today and what makes Alaska and the Kenai (for its accessibility) so special. If we are lucky enough to see wildlife, it is assuredly a highlight of the trip.

But we have also gone naively - until recently - without realizing how lacking the setback, signage and other trapping regulations are currently, including on many of the common trails we use regularly. Sadly, we have two different friends whose dogs were caught in traps in the past year on multi-use trails in Southcentral Alaska. One friend's beloved dog died in a conibear trap on a trail in Seward – it's been a heart-wrenching loss for so many and eye-opening to the risks for sure.

After reviewing Proposals #145 through and including #154, I support all of them, for the general reasons discussed above and the specific reasons outlined below:

- Regarding Proposal 145: I do not believe it is ethical or humane to allow wildlife to be hunted or trapped on and at the entrances and exits of the new wildlife underpasses and overpass on the Sterling Highway. Establishing a ¼-mile buffer zone sounds at least reasonable.
- Regarding Proposals 146 - 153: Trail-users with dogs are a large stakeholder group for Kenai area trails and the Kenai is growing rapidly. There are still many unwary people, like we were, using these trails, campgrounds, roads and pullouts. The consequences are too great to not establish the trap setbacks and other common-sense measures proposed. These would give trail-users, with and without dogs, greater confidence that they will be reasonably safe from traps in high-use areas. Meanwhile trappers would also benefit from the additional clarity. I understand that the setback distances proposed have strong community support and are considered a reasonable compromise between user groups including several local trappers consulted.
- Regarding Proposal 154: Alerting user groups and emergency responders to trapping in the area by way of simple signs posted at active trapping access points is another reasonable compromise for heavily used areas and provides an opportunity for folks who decide to (or who must) use the trails, to take additional safety precautions.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



PC359

Submitted by: Steve Williams

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. I have lived in Alaska for over 30 years and actively enjoy the outdoors with my wife and our dogs. We enjoy, as do our family and friends, the opportunities in Cooper Landing, Seward, Homer, and along the Sterling Highway to view wildlife. I support proposals 145 - 154, they are reasonable and balance the needs of multiple user groups. I encourage the Board of Game to give these proposals serious consideration and ultimately approve them. Thank you.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



PC360

Submitted by: Emily Wilson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Moose Pass, Alaska

Comment:

Commenting in support of proposals 145-154. Cooper Landing public areas need to be safe for dogs and children. It is absolutely unnecessary for trapping to happen anywhere near publicly used beaches, hiking trails, and highway pullouts. It is shocking to me that this is even an issue.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



PC361

Submitted by: Roy Wilson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer, Ak

Comment:

Proposal 149 should be approved as written.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



PC362

Submitted by: Lindsay Wolter

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer, Alaska

Comment:

I am writing in support of Proposal 146 and Proposal 147, which relate to establishing a set back for traps in areas in which I frequently travel with my dog. I personally know three dogs who have been caught in traps - one was my own, and another didn't survive. So this issue is near and dear to me. I have no problem with trapping; I do have a problem with trapping close to areas where people recreate with their pets. Both of these proposals seem like a no brainer - everyone wins if trappers continue to trap, and people can recreate in areas with less chance of their pets being trapped.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support



Submitted by: Andra Woodard

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Seward, AK

Comment:

I support proposals 145-154. It will keep our children and pets safer as we utilize the trails in and around our communities.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



Submitted by: April Woods

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Ak

Comment:

I support AWA's Proposal #145. What happen to the concept of fair chase hunting? How are hunters and trappers lined up where wildlife are forced to travel through fair? It is an assembly line of death & bag. It is the opposite of what decent hunters & citizens would allow, it is 100% wrong and evil. Protection is the opposite of extinction. Make wildlife protection, not a death trap.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 55: Oppose Proposal 56: Oppose Proposal 57: Oppose Proposal 58: Oppose Proposal 59: Oppose Proposal 60: Oppose Proposal 61: Oppose Proposal 62: Oppose Proposal 63: Oppose Proposal 64: Oppose Proposal 65: Oppose Proposal 66: Oppose Proposal 67: Oppose Proposal 68: Oppose Proposal 69: Oppose Proposal 70: Oppose Proposal 71: Oppose Proposal 72: Oppose Proposal 73: Oppose Proposal 74: Oppose Proposal 75: Oppose Proposal 76: Oppose Proposal 77: Oppose Proposal 78: Oppose Proposal 79: Oppose Proposal 80: Oppose Proposal 81: Oppose Proposal 82: Oppose Proposal 83: Oppose Proposal 84: Oppose Proposal 85: Oppose Proposal 86: Oppose Proposal 87: Oppose Proposal 88: Oppose Proposal 89: Oppose Proposal 90: Oppose Proposal 91: Oppose Proposal 92: Oppose Proposal 93: Oppose Proposal 94: Oppose Proposal 95: Oppose Proposal 96: Oppose Proposal 97: Oppose Proposal 98: Oppose Proposal 99: Oppose Proposal 100: Oppose Proposal 101: Oppose Proposal 102: Oppose Proposal 103: Oppose Proposal 104: Oppose Proposal 105: Oppose Proposal 106: Oppose Proposal 107: Oppose Proposal 108: Oppose Proposal 109: Oppose Proposal 110: Oppose Proposal 111: Oppose Proposal 112: Oppose Proposal 113: Oppose Proposal 114: Oppose Proposal 115: Oppose Proposal 116: Oppose Proposal 117: Oppose Proposal 118: Oppose Proposal 119: Oppose Proposal 120: Oppose Proposal 121: Oppose Proposal 122: Oppose Proposal 123: Oppose Proposal 124: Oppose Proposal 125:

Oppose Proposal 126: Oppose Proposal 127: Oppose Proposal 128: Oppose Proposal 129: Oppose Proposal 130: Oppose Proposal 131: Oppose Proposal 132: Oppose Proposal 133: Oppose Proposal 134: Oppose Proposal 135: Oppose Proposal 136: Oppose Proposal 137: Oppose Proposal 138: Oppose Proposal 139: Oppose Proposal 140: Oppose Proposal 141: Oppose Proposal 142: Oppose Proposal 143: Oppose Proposal 144: Oppose Proposal 145: Support Proposal 146: Support Proposal 147: Support Proposal 148: Oppose Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support Proposal 155: Oppose Proposal 156: Support Proposal 157: Support Proposal 158: Support Proposal 159: Oppose Proposal 160: Support Proposal 161: Oppose Proposal 162: Oppose Proposal 163: Oppose Proposal 164: Oppose Proposal 165: Oppose Proposal 166: Oppose Proposal 167: Oppose Proposal 168: Oppose Proposal 169: Oppose Proposal 170: Oppose Proposal 171: Oppose Proposal 172: Oppose Proposal 173: Oppose Proposal 174: Oppose Proposal 175: Oppose Proposal 176: Oppose Proposal 177: Oppose Proposal 178: Oppose Proposal 179: Oppose Proposal 180: Oppose Proposal 181: Oppose Proposal 182: Oppose Proposal 183: Oppose Proposal 184: Oppose Proposal 185: Oppose Proposal 186: Oppose Proposal 187: Oppose Proposal 188: Oppose Proposal 200: Oppose Proposal 203: Oppose Proposal 204: Oppose Proposal 205: Oppose Proposal 207: Oppose Proposal 208: Oppose



PC365

Submitted by: Stephanie Wright

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Seward, AK

Comment:

To whom it may concern: I am in support of the proposals numbered 145 and 149 through 154. They are requesting setbacks of traps along trails in public use areas. I often ski, walk, and hike with dogs and although they are generally on a leash I believe that traps should not be close to these hiking and skiing areas. I have known at least three people who have had their dogs caught in traps. One of the dogs died. In some of these instances, the setbacks would probably have resulted in dog not getting ensnared. Please sign these proposals into law so that we can keep our pets and even our children safe. Thank you.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 145: Support Proposal 149: Support Proposal 150: Support Proposal 151: Support Proposal 152: Support Proposal 153: Support Proposal 154: Support



Submitted by: Stig Yngve

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak

Comment:

see attached

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

**PROPOSAL 73**

As the proposer I am in favor of Proposal 73.

Kodiak Island deer populations are very low and depressed after two consecutive hard winters in 2020 and 2021. There are not enough deer for people, especially Kodiak Island and Kodiak Native Village residents to obtain enough deer meat for subsistence. I suggest that the bag limit for Sitka black-tailed deer in Unit 8 be reduced to two deer a year for Alaska residents and one deer a year for nonresidents.

PROPOSAL 74

As the Proposer I am in favor of Proposal 74

This is mainly an issue with Transporter deer hunts, but to some degree with float plane and wheel plane, and non-transported boat based hunts too. By law all meat of the ribs, neck, brisket, front and hind quarters, back strap and tenderloins have to be harvested. A mature Sitka black tail buck yields 50-85 pounds of boned out meat and a mature doe yields 25-60 pounds of boned out meat. This proposal simply curbs any chance of in the field wanton waste.

PROPOSAL 75

As the Proposer I am in favor of Proposal 75

Amend to Count brown bear wounded by hunters in Unit 8 against the bag limit of one bear every four **REGULATORY** years as follows: If you wound a bear in Unit 8, you cannot hunt for bear again in Unit 8 for four regulatory years.

The main goal here is to treat a wounded bear the same as harvested bear and reflect the same rate of harvest. I would like to address the issue of wounded bears in Unit 8. Because a calendar year of hunting is different than a regulatory management year, a person can legally wound a bear in a spring hunt on Kodiak Island and hunt again legally in the fall because the Fish and Game regulatory year ended in July of the same year. I would like to see this changed such that a wounded bear in Unit 8 counts against your tag, just like a harvested bear. It is an issue of hunting morality and ethics that needs to be addressed.

PROPOSAL 76

I am vehemently opposed to this proposal for many reasons.

1. Bears are not a problem on the Kodiak Road System. PEOPLE and their waste disposal is the problem. This proposed very generous and lax hunting season would promote more killing of sows and especially, **KILLING THE WRONG BEAR.** Not necessarily killing of problem bears. Many times late in the year **SOWS WITH CUBS** are out still



catching late Silver salmon. These bears are out in the open all day, around people, and to increase the chance past November 30th that one of these bears could be inadvertently shot, it's not good at all. It would overall make for a lower Bear population, with less sows and cubs which is not desirable. Kodiak Island and its Bears and people are supposed to be a shining example of symbiosis and coexisting for the whole world to see. This proposed solution undermines that in the worst way.

2. **Other user groups like nature photographers and enthusiasts** shoot these bears...WITH CAMERAS year 'round. Some come from all over the world to do it. It is a beautiful and unique resource, a photogenic and accessible bear population that you don't have to go in a bush plane or boat to see. These bears live in close proximity to humans on the Kodiak Road System their whole lives and to destroy or compromise that is just ludicrous in the worst way.

3. **Ranching** has been going on in Kodiak for over 200 years and A LOT OF BEARS HAVE BEEN SHOT as a result. They continue to be shot. Tough. Tough for cattle. Tougher for bears. When you live in bear country, that is the cost of doing business. KODIAK ISLAND IS NOT CATTLE COUNTRY. Defense of life and property is also a matter of living in Bear Country, that is the cost of doing business.

4. **My personal experience as a Bear Guide and BORN AND RAISED ALASKAN AND KODIAK ISLAND LIFETIME RESIDENT FOR 37 YEARS.** I am a Bear Guide that makes a part of my living every year hunting and killing bears on the Kodiak Road System. I have bear hunted for 13 years. I have lived around bears my whole life working and living on Kodiak Island as a commercial fisherman, Bush Resident, ADFG weir boss, personal recreator in the wild.

I have personally hunted and killed my own Kodiak Road System Bear ~~for myself.~~ **It was a problem bear.** I killed it legally and quickly during hunting season in Late November of 2012 less than a mile from my house in Monashka

Bay. He was a known menace, breaking into chicken coops and freezers, and garage doors. He even tried to break into the Salvation Army Food Bank. I talked to ALASKA STATE TROOPER [REDACTED] in advance, as well as ADF&G biologists [REDACTED] Van Daele. After a thorough briefing on legality of pursuing a bear like this, I got my bear tag. I caught up with that bear 1 day later and killed him. I have a really nice rug now.

Waste Management (Our local garbage and waste service Provider) had come in 30 minutes after I left ADF&G with my bear tag in hand, asking if they could DLP (Defense of life and Property) kill that specific bear. [REDACTED] said, "NO, you can't kill that bear. You haven't caught him red-handed yet. But don't worry, the best man for the job just walked out the door with his bear tag."

That bear had been acting like this since early October and No one had managed to hunt and kill him for almost 2 months...until I showed up.



The point is that there is ample opportunity already to harvest a road system bear, problem bear or not, 45 days in the spring and 37 days in the fall, a Guaranteed Over the counter registration bear tag, no quota for harvested bears on the road system, and if a hunter is motivated, like myself, they can harvest a bear with relative ease.

An increased hunting season will have no positive effects, short term or long term whatsoever.

This proposal would effectively increase the opportunity to hunt on the Kodiak Road System, guided or unguided. I have a vested interest here as a hunting guide. I could effectively hunt longer and kill more bears and make more money.

THAT IS THE LAST THING I WANT TO DO. We kill enough bears we are actually targeting during spring and fall hunting seasons already. There is no monetary compensation worth killing more.

Rather, my thinking comes from a conservation standpoint. Kodiak Brown Bears *URSUS ARCTOS MIDDENDORFFI* is its own unique subspecies of bears of the world, unlike any other. They are Beautiful and Fierce even Dangerous at times. As an individual it is one of the most fascinating creatures on the planet. As a quarry to pursue in fair chase hunting, it is arguably the pinnacle of hunting. There are always going to be problem bears and dead cows and horses and other livestock, broken into freezers and raided chicken coops etc. We are always going to learn and relearn how to coexist with Bears on Kodiak Island.

An increased hunting season would accomplish nothing positive whatsoever on any level.

SOLUTION

I suggest forming a Kodiak Road System Bear task force, composed of a member of the ALASKA DEPT. OF FISH AND GAME WILDLIFE DIVISION., ALASKA STATE TROOPERS, KODIAK CITY POLICE, and REGISTERED HUNTING GUIDES, and 1 concerned citizen not on the ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE. I nominate Nate Szoboda or Bill Dunker for ADF&G. Either one will do.

1 member of the Alaska State Troopers. I nominate [REDACTED]

1 Member of the Kodiak City Police. I nominate [REDACTED]

Also a short running list of Registered Bear Guides that live on the Kodiak Road System to aid in our goal of a cohesive existence with our Bears. We are crucial for this cause because we observe and study bears, live in bear country in tents for the better part of 2 months a year, and kill bears for a living. And no one is better qualified than ourselves for something of this nature.



I nominate myself Stig Yngve. I also Nominate [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Anyone else who believes they are qualified for this position should also volunteer themselves.

For a concerned citizen I nominate [REDACTED]

The goal is to find a unified and unanimous diplomatic as possible solution to keep problem bears alive and well on the Kodiak Road System.

If lethal force and the need to kill a bear is called for then, that is where Registered Guides like ourselves would be most instrumental for the cause.

THE LAST THING I WANT TO DO IS KILL KODIAK ROAD SYSTEM BEARS...unless I am hunting them on a guided hunt as form of my livelihood, or for the safety of the Kodiak Road system and its human and Bear residents.

PROPOSAL 191

As the proposer I am in favor of Proposal 191.

There are too many transporter boats on Kodiak Island during the fall deer hunting season. The biggest concerns are **safety for other hunters and land and sea resource users of Kodiak Island, quality experience for transported deer hunt clients, and proper use of a resource (Deer) as a form of subsistence.** I would like there to be a set and finite amount of transporters allowed to operate on Kodiak Island, with preference going to those with those with the best safety record and longest standing in operation, with preference going to land based transport operations in Kodiak Island Villages. There was a huge increase in deer hunting transported hunts following the 2016 hunting season when Kodiak Island had upwards of 100,000 deer on the island. Subsequent harsh winters in 2017, 2018, 2020 and 2021 have reduced the deer population by half or a lot more in certain geographic areas like Afognak Island, Northeast Kodiak Island, the East side of Kodiak Island all the Way to Sitkalidak Island and the whole West side of the Island from Viekoda Bay to Sturgeon River. Each year since 2016, there are more of these boats because of a boom year in '16. Some are fully accountable for their actions and run good ethical operations, especially land based ones of long repute on Kodiak Island, many others boat-based, from elsewhere have not spent a great deal of time on Kodiak Island, but simply show up as opportunistic vultures, johnnycomelatels if you will. They are reckless in landing clients on beaches to hunt, have ZERO accountability for wanton waste of deer on their vessels, zero regard for sport crab and rockfish stocks, not logging that data at all like a normal sport fishing charter is required to do with a mandatory logbook. They run amok completely unaccounted for. They are generally quite rude and territorial as well, regarding hunting areas that they operate in, claiming it as "theirs" when subsistence hunters like myself from Kodiak Island are out trying to



fill our freezers for the year. There can at times be upwards of 20 armed to the teeth transported deer hunters in a bay at one time competing with local resident hunters for deer. It is dangerous. Sooner or later someone will get shot inadvertently because there are too many people in the field in one area at a time. Many of these boats homestead in the same general areas, making as if they have a predetermined destination in mind, which, unless specified by paying clients, could be considered illegal guiding. There is a lot of borderline gray stuff going on, and I want 100 % accountability by transporters. **LIMITING THEM** to a single transporter season in Either KODIAK, UNIT 8, ^{or} elsewhere will make for a safer, better all-round experience for everyone as a whole.

PROPOSAL 192

As the proposer, I am in favor of Proposal 192. My sentiments are echoed as above in PROPOSAL 191. The best time for transporter deer hunts is during the rut in November. By having a specific transporter season for the peak of colder fall weather for optimum hunting conditions, Late October- November, coinciding with the rut, and bear hunting (October 25th –November 30th and April 1st to May 15th,, hunters will have the best hunting experience, and give resident and non-transported hunters a chance to hunt before and after the rut without the added pressure and inconveniences that come with ever increasing pressure from transporter hunts. Transporters will still have full opportunity to transport bear hunters and Goat hunters from October 25th onward to reflect the Bear season and Extended Registration 480 goat season.

PROPOSAL 193

As the proposer, I am in favor of Proposal 193

Again, same sentiments as echoed in proposals ___73, 74, 191, 192. The bottom line here is accountability for actions of a boat and its crew and its clientele. **WANTON WASTE** is a major theme. I have been witness to dumped bags of deer meat in dumpsters at Kodiak and Native Village boat harbors because transported deer hunters didn't want the meat and didn't care about meat or ethics or the law. Owners and captains of transporter vessels are choosing to look the other way at clients and their dead deer. When you come back to a boat with only the back strap and the head, a boat Captain should be turning in the hunter /client for wanton waste to Alaska State



Troopers. I have also been witness to rockfish overharvest, mass exploitation of subsistence crab stocks, King crab poaching, rampant trespassing...the list goes on and on.

Regarding safety, many vessels have a mate and a captain and only the Captain has a 6pack license for transporting clients, yet the mate is most often transporting clients to and from shore while the Captain keeps an eye on the main vessel. They are all implicated. This is magnified when a single owner of multiple vessels has rentaskippers, boat captains for hire, running their boat(s), and they don't know what is really happening and **THEY DON'T CARE** because they are not actually present, they are just collecting money with no consequence for the actions of **THEIR** boat and crew and clients. Having a single transporting vessel per owner and business would demand that the accountability be attached to one entity, thus theoretically reducing by half or more, any and all illegal and questionable activities regarding transport hunting.



Submitted by: Dennis Zwiefelhofer

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, AK

Comment:

I would like to voice support for Proposals 164-170, regarding reduction of bag limits for Goldeneye, Bufflehead, Harlequin & Long-tailed Duck. Hunter take is an additive mortality to these diminishing waterfowl species and should be lowered. Current bag limits are biologically unsupported given these species natural history and reproductive success.

I would also like to voice my support for Proposal 171. Harvest data is valuable management tool for many species and given the additive nature of hunter harvest to sea duck mortality rates should be utilized to aid in conserving diminishing sea duck populations.

I would also voice support for Proposal 172 for the same reasons listed above. Common sense dictates the need to know the scope of harvest mortality to maintain sea duck populations at viable levels.

Lastly, I vehemently oppose Proposal 163 for all the reasons I support Proposal 164-172. The increase in current harvest levels resulting from this proposal can only further damage the already decreased sea duck populations.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 163: Oppose Proposal 164: Support Proposal 165: Support Proposal 166: Support Proposal 167: Support Proposal 168: Support Proposal 169: Support Proposal 170: Support Proposal 171: Support Proposal 172: Support



Submitted by: Geoffrey Davies

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Wasilla, Alaska

Comment:

I agree with Caleb Martin to clarify the definitions. Each officer shouldnt be left to determine for Him/Herself what constitutes these areas on an individual basis.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:



PC369

Submitted by: Molly Fierro

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage AK

Comment:

Trapping along recreational trails needs to be controlled. I strongly support at least a 100 yard setback.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:



PC370

Submitted by: Tina Seaton

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer, AK

Comment:

Please pass the proposal to require 100 yd setbacks for traps from recreational trails and ski trails. Alaskans are outdoor people and dog people. They should be able to use our hiking and ski trails without fear of being injured in traps set on or near the trails.

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:



PC371

Submitted by: Daniel Wood

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: 34581 N Fork Rd

Comment:

I oppose the proposals selected

Note: Respondents were allowed to participate in an optional survey to indicate support or opposition for proposals using the online comment submission form. This information allows Board Support staff to develop an index for the meeting and is included below as a courtesy:

Proposal 120: Support Proposal 121: Support Proposal 122: Support Proposal
123: Support Proposal 124: Support Proposal 125: Support Proposal 126: Support Proposal 129: Support Proposal 133:
Oppose Proposal 134: Support Proposal 135: Support Proposal 136: Support Proposal 145: Oppose Proposal 146:
Oppose Proposal 147: Oppose Proposal 148: Oppose Proposal 149: Oppose Proposal 150: Oppose Proposal 151: Oppose
Proposal 152: Oppose Proposal 153: Oppose Proposal 154: Oppose Proposal 155: Oppose Proposal 156: Oppose Proposal
157: Oppose Proposal 158: Oppose Proposal 159: Oppose Proposal 160: Oppose Proposal 161: Oppose Proposal 162:
Oppose Proposal 163: Oppose Proposal 164: Oppose Proposal 165: Oppose Proposal 166: Oppose Proposal 167: Oppose
Proposal 168: Oppose Proposal 169: Oppose Proposal 170: Oppose Proposal 171: Oppose Proposal 172: Oppose
