



Submitted by: Chuck Adams

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cody, Wyoming

Comment:

Gentlemen,

Thank you for considering the postponement of Proposal 73. When I became aware of this Proposal, I had already booked non-refundable airline tickets to Kodiak, sent a deposit to my air taxi operator, shipped more than 150 pounds of camping and hunting equipment to Kodiak, and cleared my schedule for my customary one-month August bowhunt on the Island. I always plan far ahead.

If the one-buck Proposal holds for 2023, I will be forced to cancel my AK plans at a financial loss and arrange to have all that gear shipped back to my home for a substantial fee. There is simply no way to justify the high expense of traveling north for one deer, or spending a whole month of vacation time for one critter. It is too late for me to make other summer hunting arrangements if the Proposal is not postponed, creating a recreational and monetary hardship.

I also write articles full-time for hunting magazines, and I would have to cancel seven assignments I already have for this August's hunt. I could not recover that income.

I have been backpacking for deer on Kodiak Island since the 1980's, and it is the single most enjoyable thing I do. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Chuck Adams

Dear Board Of Game Members,

I have already submitted a comment about my support for delay of Proposal 73, but I would like to add my perspective as a long-time and avid deer hunter on Kodiak. I am not a resident, but nobody loves hunting the Island more than I do.

Several of my Alaska resident friends have told me they are concerned about increased nonresident Kodiak deer hunting pressure in the fall, particularly from commercially operated charter boats in October and November. They acknowledge that Proposal 73 is about people management, not deer management, and I respect their viewpoint. Everyone agrees the only thing that manages deer numbers on Kodiak is winter weather.

Many more Kodiak deer are near the ocean during autumn months, making them easy targets in some locations. But there is never such pressure in August and September because most deer are concentrated in high, remote places. That is when my multi-buck hunting acquaintances and I visit Kodiak for serious backpack fun. We do not see other hunters, do not interfere with residents, and certainly do not deplete deer populations.

It seems reasonable to allow multiple nonresident buck harvest in August and September, and to reduce the bag limit beginning October 1 if the Board deems this necessary. Deer are too difficult to reach in the summer for there ever to be hunter congestion or competition with residents. Deer hunting from charter boats, aircraft, and other forms of ocean access simply is not practical during summertime on Kodiak.

I realize that changing the rules is not the purpose of the Special Board Meeting on May 25. But please consider a split season with split bag limit as a possible future solution to everyone's concerns. I see no downside and plenty of upside to such a change in the regulations.

Respectfully

Chuck Adams



PC02

Submitted by: Justin Adams

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer Ak

Comment:

There is no scientific research to show that unit 8 deer for non residents needs to be drop to 1 deer. Just because people can get them on the road system doesn't mean the rest of the unit is struggling. By doing this you will be taking alot of money out of Alaska, out of the city of kodiak and the hands of Alaskans.



PC03

Submitted by: Zac Jones

Organization Name: Alaska Guide Creations

Community of Residence: Price, UT

Comment:

Dear AK Board of Game,

I am writing this email in regards to the tag limit changes on Kodiak Island Sitka Deer for nonresidents. Please consider reversing this change back to the original 3 tag limit or at least a compromise of 2. This is one of the very few hunts left that the average hunter can afford to go on in Alaska and the upside of being able to potentially harvest 1, 2, or 3 bucks increases the appeal. Speaking for myself and my nonresident friends that love to go to Kodiak and hunt these deer, the change of the bag limit down to 1 would greatly reduce the appeal and cause us to reconsider future trips. I do not think that we are alone in our thinking which has a good chance at reducing overall revenues including, but not limited to, tag sales, charter services, air services, and local sales from hotels, restaurants, and stores.

Kodiak is an incredible place to hunt Sitka Deer and the ability to have multiple tags makes the ever increasing cost of the trip worth it.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and consider my view.



PC04

Submitted by: Austin Atkinson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cedar City, Utah

Comment:

I strongly urge the board to reconsider the implementation of the proposal that limits the hunters deer bag limit for Unit 8, Remainder (Kodiak Island). I strongly believe that the primary reason an annual bag limit should be reduced would be for the health and sustainability of the resource (deer herd). Secondly, I believe that Alaska local populations should have access to sustainable populations of game for traditional harvest and game meat supplies. Third, I feel that Alaska residents should have priority when setting hunting seasons and restrictions before opportunities are allowed for non-resident sportsmen.

I feel that this restriction and accepted proposal was inconsistent with biological reports from the ADF&G and those most familiar with the resource. The Kodiak Archipelago provides a great opportunity for all hunters to pursue this non-native species which has flourished on the island. Not allowing multiple harvest for non-resident hunters unjustifiably targets those hunters coming to Alaska to pursue deer that are considered, in my mind, excess by hunters that fund local guides, transporters, businesses, and the ADF&G Department. We know the harsh effect winters can have on the deer herd as a bad winter can take 10x the amount of deer that sport hunting can take in a season.

If the concern is that non-residents are over-harvesting deer, please consider restricting non-residents to bucks only, instead of the current "any deer" regulation.

I have similar comments concerning the management of Dall sheep. The sustainability of the resource is the priority. Removing the non-resident hunt out of the 19C subunit for 5 years does three things; it shows distrust the Board of Game has in full-curl harvest management, it places distrust in the commercial services (registered guides) in managing their own customers' hunts, and it shows favoritism to those Alaska resident hunters that will now have their own "sanctuary" to hunt sheep with no guides or non-residents in the area. This is wrong and alternative options must be considered.



PC05

Submitted by: Drake Atwood

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Rexburg, Idaho

Comment:

Hi,

I am firmly opposed to cutting deer tags from three tags to one. It makes what is normally a prized adventure to one that cannot be financially justified. And when you've already booked your flights and already submitted deposits for charters for this year, like many of us have, it is quite aggravating! For someone like me, who has waited years to be able to hunt Blacktail on Kodiak, it is very disheartening to not get my money's worth.

I can only imagine the number of nonresident hunters who will allocate their hunting dollars to other opportunities, not able to justify the cost of travel to and throughout Alaska for just one deer. Please, please reverse the tag quotas back to 3 tags in unit 8 and restore what many regard as a hunt of a lifetime.

Kindest regards,

Drake Atwood



PC06

Submitted by: Shaun Ayers

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Davis, CA

Comment:

Board of Game members,

Unless there is a strong concern for the health of the herd, please consider reversing the one deer limit or keep the limit at 2 for nonresidents in Unit 8.

Myself and a friend have an archery hunt planned for August this year. Our entire trip including amount of time, number of people, location, etc. were planned around being able to hunt more than one deer. We would have made different choices or reconsidered the trip entirely if the limit was one. My hunting partner in particular is a young man working as a wildland firefighter so the financial burden of the trip is significant.

This will be my fourth trip to Kodiak. I will say the 3 deer limit is too much. My first two trips were with Alaska residents that rifle killed limits, 15 bucks on one trip and 18 on another. I honestly felt like this had a big impact on the local deer, overloaded our planes, and made for logistical difficulties getting back home.

I do agree hunts on Kodiak are becoming very popular and the impact on the deer is high, but putting the entire burden of reduced limits on nonresidents seems unfair and overly impactful to the businesses on Kodiak that the nonresident hunters support. Please consider more nuanced ways of reducing the impact, for example archery vs rifle limits, seasonal time limits to reduce rut harvest, harvest distance from ocean limits, etc.

Kodiak hunting is an incredible experience and although as an archery hunter I won't often kill two deer, the ability to trophy hunt after harvesting one deer makes it worth the significant time and financial investment of the trip.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Best Regards,

Shaun Ayers, Product Director, KUIU Ultralight Hunting



PC07

Submitted by: bryan Bailey

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Onalaska, Wa

Comment:

The reduction in deer harvest to NON- residents only has no biological data to support. Winter kill is the main & biggest factor in deer numbers.

I put a group of 8 hunters to come and hunt Kodiak in 2023 and the main factor was the opportunity to harvest more than 1 animal. After hearing about reduction in NON-

resident tags several in the group are not wanting to go. That would be a loss to lots of different businesses in Alaska & Kodiak directly.

Please rethink the proposal 73 decision.

Thank you,

Bryan Bailey



PC08

Submitted by: Elijah Bair

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Carson, WA

Comment:

Please reconsider from lowering your bag limit for unit 8 deer. I hunted that unit for deer in November 2022 and i walked away literally thinking you guys would be raising the limit in the future because i saw so many deer. So from a nonresident point of a view i am very confused why you are lowering the bag limit, i saw more deer on kodiak in that 7 days hunting then i would sometimes see during a fall in Washington state. From what i understand the winters are the biggest killers of sitka blacktail, i think even if you lower the limit, the same amount of deer will still die due to the harsh winter, competition with other deer and predators. Also the state, guides, transporters, and the economy on the town of kodiak will take a big hit due to you lowering the bag limit, alot of money you are throwing away and screwing alot of businesses also. Maybe i am completely missing something and dont understand being a non resident nor a biologist, and i

am sorry in advance if i missed some facts but from what I experienced in November of 2022 i just dont understand why you would lower the bag limit, it just doesn't make sense to me. Maybe meet in the middle and lower it to 2? Try that and see how it works for everyone, just 1 deer seems pretty crazy for the amount of deer i saw and the negative economic impacts to people and businesses. Thank you very much for taking your time to read this and i hope you reconsider lowering the bag limit. - Eli Bair



PC09

Submitted by: Becky Bean

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak AK

Comment:

Off island transport operations have completely taken over. We used to rely on deer meat for subsistence but Its been getting harder and harder to get deer meat for the winter. Our family and many others have been buying more and more store bought meat with is very expensive here.

Nonresident deer hunters provide very little economic boost for the community. Lots of the big transport operations fly their hunters strait from anchorage to either the boat of lodge completey bypassing the town of Kodiak



PC10

Submitted by: Joseph Birkmeyer

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

Due to the amount of nonresident hunters coming to Kodiak for deer season, it has been difficult for the local residents of Kodiak to maintain subsistence throughout the winter season. This is due to both nonresident hunters and Alaskan residence NOT residing in Kodiak come to hunt our deer using charters and transporters.



PC11

Submitted by: Keith Bliss

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Spring city

Comment:

Hello

I booked a hunt for sitka Blacktails in zone #8 over a year ago. I recently was made aware that you are considering changing the quota limits on the deer from 3 to 1, this is very disappointing for us non residents who put out a lot of money and effort to plan a hunt which may be a hunt of a lifetime, I'm 67 will be 68 when my hunt will take place. I will never have another opportunity like this again. I wish you would reconsider this new proposal, and leave it at a 3 limit. This would give a person a chance to judge the quality of a animal and not shoot the first deer that pops up. This would be a better way on managing the deer quality. It seems like the nonresident is being handicapped. We are trying to help the economy.

Please reconsider the new quota limit

Thank You

Keith Bliss



PC12

Submitted by: Randy Blondin

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

My name is Randy Blondin I was born and raised in Kodiak Alaska and I shot my first Sitka Blacktail deer in Kodiak 60 years ago and have hunted them every year since, therefore I consider myself an expert on the subject. I believe this regulation that passed the board to reduce one deer on Kodiak Island to non-residents is ridiculous and accomplishes nothing. I can give plenty of reasons why it only hurts a lot of people: 1) the winter conditions is what regulates the deer numbers on Kodiak Island and the hunting pressure has very little impact, and right now the numbers are good. 2) Most nonresidents don't even hunt the same area's as local residents and the stats show that a nonresident only shoots 1.2 deer a year anyway. 3) Even though nonresidents usually only take one deer a year they usually purchase 2 or 3 tags which at \$300.00 each generates a lot of money towards the resource. 4) While the state loses a lot of money so are the transporters and guides, as our family operation has had to return and is in the process of returning a lot of money because hunters are interpreting this as a signal that the deer numbers are way down, therefore they now want to cancel their trip. In ending I can simply sum it up like this, If you look at the stats and information it is clear that this rule will have almost zero impact other than the state, transporters and outfitters losing a lot of money for nothing. My biggest complaint is the short notice, there are plenty of hunting operations like ours that have clients that have come for numerous years and some have booked several years out to now be told on a very short notice that there is a major change. Even though I think this proposal should be overturned I am asking the State of Alaska and or the Board of game to please at least postpone it for a year to give everyone a chance to prepare the public to a major change like this. Fish and Game agrees with my

assessment that there is no biological reason for this. So my last word is what is the big rush. Thank you for your consideration



PC13

Submitted by: Jeffrey Bloomquist

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Ridgefield, wa

Comment:

As a nonresident hunter who has hunted Kodiak a few times and plans to go back in 2024, please consider reversing the proposed tag cut from 3 to 1 on Kodiak Island. Trim it back to two if you need to but to fly all the way up there for one deer tag does not make it worth it. This will have a impact on the local economy as nonresidents decide to hunt other places. Perhaps if there are certain areas that there is a conflict with residents, the numbers could be lowered in that area but kept the same in other areas? Please consider other alternatives besides dropping the limit to one for the entire island.

Thanks for your consideration,



PC14

Submitted by: Charles Bongard

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Prairie du Sac, Wisconsin

Comment:

I am writing to state my opposition to proposal 73 limiting non-resident hunters to one deer on Kodiak Island. I understand establishing limits to protect species based on scientific guidelines. It is my understanding that Alaska Fish and Game has stated that there is no scientific basis for this proposed limit on deer. We booked our hunt for 2023 a year in advance with an understanding that we may be able to purchase a second tag to extend our hunt. This proposal will result in lost revenue to the State. Again, if there is a biological reason to do this fine, otherwise if it's not broke, don't fix it.. thank you.



Submitted by: Jess Bradley

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Brevard, NC

Comment:

I would ask that you delay implementation for these regulations. Alaska is a special place and offers opportunities to nonresidents found no where else in the United States. However, due to Alaska's location and the expenses associated with it, nonresident hunters generally have to plan years in advance to make a trip. One of the downsides to planning an Alaska trip is that nonresidents must pay for accommodations, plane tickets, transporter fees, and a host of other expenses before policy changes are even discussed for the first time. With a year of notice, people can change plans, but when changes are made just a few short months before season, most things have already been paid for. If there is concrete reasoning based on real biologic factors, I can support a policy change at any point in time. In this instance, the reasoning behind the regulations for Unit 8 deer do not seem based on biology, and are not pressing enough to warrant immediate implementation. So once again, I would ask that you please delay implementation of these regulations. At the very least it will allow nonresidents time to adjust without causing a negative impact on wildlife.

Thank you



Submitted by: Alton Brown

Organization Name: High Country Alaska

Community of Residence: Palmer, AK

Comment:

My full comment is attached. The Board of Game is setting a dangerous, un-American, and anti-hunting precedent with the closure of a nonresident season without any change to the resident season. The closure was never backed by ADF&G or the local biologists.



Alaska Board of Game,

Part of what makes the United States of America the greatest country in the world is the ease of access for our citizens to hunt. Domestic and International groups threaten our rights at an alarmingly increasing rate every single day. These threats have spilled over to Alaska as we are currently fighting the FSB and their overreach and many other groups . In Unit 19, Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the local biologists do not support the closure of the sheep season. The closure of the nonresident sheep season without any change to the resident season shows that The Board of Game made this a political issue and not a biological decision.

The argument is that nonresident hunters make up 60% of the hunter population in the Unit and harvest 85% of the sheep with higher success rates. These harvest statistics do not include all the Outfitters, Guides, Packers, and Air charter companies that play a significant role in the success of the hunt. If these people are included in the nonresident success rate the rates would be very similar to resident success. The outfitters and guides are also in the area 2-6 months of the year and know their respective areas like they know their own backyards. This also plays a significant role in nonresident success.

The Board of Game has set a very dangerous precedent in dangerous times with this ruling. Closing the season to nonresidents without having any change to the resident season is un-American at its core. I urge the Board to think of the consequences for hunting in our great State and how the decision affects the lives of the residents who depend on nonresident hunters for a significant portion of their livelihood.

Sincerely,
Alton Joe Brown



Submitted by: Cole Bures

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Filley Nebraska

Comment:

Hello, as a non-resident to Alaska I will state that I oppose the ruling to drop the zone 8 deer tags from 3 to 1 for non-resident hunters. As with many hunts in Alaska the fee to get into many of the remote areas is quite expensive so getting the most out of every hunt is important. I had planned on doing a hunt on Kodiak this fall as there was a chance to get 3 deer, when I saw that the permits were being limited to only 1 deer I had to question whether it was worth the price of the flights now for only one tag. I had since opted to not do the hunt because of that, and I'm sure I'm not the only one. The loss in hunting opportunities will provide less income to private chartering businesses and other local businesses in the areas. Not to mention the state will lose the sale of more non-resident tags as most everyone would be buying more than one deer tag if they're going.

Unless the state fish and game can justify the drop in tags because of damage to the health of the deer herd, I do not feel there should be any change to the tags allotted.

I really hope this gets postponed or changed as I would really love to go hunting for blacktail on Kodiak.

Thanks



Date: May 17, 2023

From: Bryan Burkhardt

To: Alaska Board of Game

Subject: Request to Delay Implementation of Proposal 73

Dear Alaska Board of Game,

I am requesting that you support delaying the implementation of proposal 73. I have bowhunted Kodiak for blacktail deer several times. In fact, I am already booked to bowhunt Sitka blacktail on Kodiak this year and next year. I bowhunt Kodiak because I enjoy adventure and I love to bring home the excellent meat from a blacktail deer to share with family and friends.

As a non-resident, there is considerable expense, time and travel to hunt Kodiak. Spending thousands of dollars to hunt one buck is not something many non-residents will be willing to do. I have several friends telling me that they won't be going to Kodiak if proposal 73 gets implemented. Please consider the economic impact of not having non-residents coming up to hunt Sitka blacktail deer on Kodiak.

If the issue is low deer populations on Kodiak, then I'm all for reducing bag limits until the population recovers. However, it seems that it would be more appropriate and effective, to limit all hunters to two bucks (maybe an exception for local Kodiak Island residents). **Please support delaying the implementation of proposal 73.**

Sincerely,

Bryan Burkhardt

[REDACTED]

Clarkston, MI [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



PC19

Submitted by: James Campbell

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Comment:

All,

I vehemently oppose the delay of closure in GMU 19C for non-resident hunters. This can, has been kicked down the road for far too long. Do not bow to the pressure of Guides and outfitters. Close 19C to non-resident hunters immediately!



PC20

Submitted by: Derrick Campbell

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

I think the passing of proposal 73 should be carefully considered. With Alaska fish and game being opposed to the regulation change, I fear the deer will bounce back fast and areas will become overpopulated before regulations can be adjusted to meet the rise in population. This could lead to easily transmitted diseases and competition for habitat causing higher winter mortality. Overpopulation also affects brown bear habitat.



PC21

Submitted by: Nick Carrico

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Butte Valley, CA

Comment:

To whom it concerns,

I am reaching out urging you to reverse the proposed decrease in non resident deer tags on Kodiak Island Alaska. This change would severely disrupt the value of making the trip to Alaska. I am a part of a group of eight that will be hunting Kodiak Island this fall. we purchased this trip with the understanding we could harvest mor than one deer. The money I

spend in the local economy benefits many of the Alaskan residents by utilizing their services and would hate to see them missing out on the opportunity to showcase what a great place Kodiak is to visit and hunt.

Thank you for your consideration,

Nick Carrico



Dear Alaska Game and Fish,

I am writing to respectfully request permission to harvest up to three blacktail deer as a non-resident hunter in the state of Alaska. As an avid hunter and conservationist, I have a deep appreciation for the importance of responsible wildlife management and the need to maintain healthy populations of game species.

I understand that recently the board voted to reduce the number of bucks from 3 to 1 that non-residents are able to harvest. I believe that allowing non-residents to harvest up to three deer would provide a number of benefits to both hunters and the state's wildlife management efforts.

First and foremost, allowing non-residents to harvest more than one deer would help to promote responsible hunting practices and ensure that only healthy animals are taken. By limiting non-residents to a single deer, there is a greater temptation to take the first animal encountered, even if it is not an ideal specimen. Allowing for the harvest of up to three deer would give hunters the opportunity to be more selective, choosing only the healthiest animals and leaving weaker specimens to contribute to the overall population.

In addition, allowing non-residents to take more than one deer would provide a greater incentive for hunters to visit Alaska and contribute to the state's economy. Hunting is an important source of revenue for many communities in the state, and increasing the number of deer that non-residents can harvest could attract more hunters and provide a boost to local businesses.

Finally, I believe that increasing the number of deer that non-residents can harvest would have little impact on the overall health of the blacktail deer population in Alaska. The state's wildlife management experts have demonstrated their ability to carefully manage populations of game species, and I trust that they would not allow non-residents to harvest more than is sustainable.

In closing, I respectfully request that you consider my request to allow non-residents to harvest up to three blacktail deer per hunting season. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Carl Carter

[REDACTED]

Lansing, MI [REDACTED]



PC23

Submitted by: Jay Cherok

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer, AK

Comment:

I agree that non resident hunters should be limited on the amount of animals that they should be allowed to harvest. These animals are the resources of the people that live here. It is not for the non residents to decimate the population. Guides will still have plenty of opportunity to make their money. They need to be regulated so the next generation of guides can also have a future. And the cost for a non resident license should be increased as well to allow more funding for research and management of these resources.



PC24

Submitted by: Jeremiah Clark

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Pleasant Plains Arkansas

Comment:

I hunted using a boat in November of 2021, I never seen another hunter in the 7 days, I seen at least 100 deer a day. Please don't lower the tags in areas that have high numbers of deer. I'm going back this November to hunt, it's sad that jealous residents that don't hunt the remote areas have pressed this on nonresidents. I do understand areas with low numbers reduced but areas with high numbers of deer shouldn't be done this way.

Sincerely Jeremiah Clark



PC25

Submitted by: Scott Collins

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, Alaska

Comment:

I strongly urge the BOG to not delay implementation of non-resident and youth sheep hunting restrictions in 19C. Please have those restrictions take effect in fall 2023 as you have already decided to do.

I am a life long Alaska resident and have been sheep hunting in Alaska for more than 30 years, including hunting sheep in 19C since 2005 and as recently as 2021. I am grateful for the sheep hunting opportunities that Alaska has provided me and am passionate about protecting sheep hunting opportunity in the years to come. My first hand observation and

experience are that the sheep population in 19C is down substantially during the last several years. I believe the primary cause is hard winters, but regardless, the population is down. During the last 17 years, I've also witnessed guided non-resident sheep hunters begin to account for a vast majority of the harvest, in part due to unlimited guided non-resident pressure on state land.

I support the decision made by the BOG to eliminate non-resident and youth sheep hunting in 19C for 5 years, effective during the fall of 2023. In 2022 non-residents harvested 90% of the sheep taken in 19C. To offset recent hard winters and given the current low sheep population, it is prudent to restrict non-resident sheep hunting in 19C. Delaying implementation of that restriction will delay recovery of the sheep population. A delay in implementation would be particularly harmful because guides will know that this is the last year that they can harvest sheep for 5 years. That will incentivize them to take as many hunters as possible in 2023 (there are no limits on the number of hunters they can take) and kill as many sheep as possible (likely resulting in more marginal or sub-legal rams being killed).

Thank you,

Scott Collins

Anchorage, Alaska



PC26

Submitted by: Todd Compston

Organization Name: Non resident hunter

Community of Residence: Elko, Nevada

Comment:

Good morning, my name is Todd Compston a non resident hunter from Nevada, I strongly oppose the implementation proposal of reducing the non resident bag limit for deer in unit 8 from three to one Buck. I scheduled my deer hunt on Kodiak Island back in 2021 for this year the 2023 season. When we booked our hunt you could harvest 3 deer. I totally understand to lower the limit due to a winter kill, but since there wasn't a bad winter there is no Biological reason to do this. Non residents slightly average over one deer per hunter. This measure would have minimal effect on the deer harvest. Please consider putting the non resident limit at a minimal back to two deer. Thank you for your time. Todd compston, Elko Nevada.



PC27

Submitted by: Dennis Coppock

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Monument, Colorado

Comment:

Good morning,

I've been saving money for 3 years to go on a Sitka Unit 8 guided hunt on Kodiak Island in 2025 for my 50th birthday but if you change the limit from 3 bucks to 1 buck there is no way I'm spending that kind of money for this hunt. From

what I have found from my own research this drop in limit numbers is against sound deer biologist information and is only for the benefit of local hunters.

How much money will the state and local economies loose by instituting a 1 buck limit for non-resident hunters? I'm not sure of that answer but I do know you will be loosing my money.

Sincerely,

Dennis Coppock



PC28

Submitted by: Kyle Crow

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Port Lions, Alaska

Comment:

Concerning Special Meeting – Delay implementation for regulations re: Unit 8 deer and 19C Sheep: I support the new regulation as it stands and oppose delaying or amending it in any way. Port Lions has been experiencing a massive influx of ATV deer hunters that arrive by ferry from the mainland every fall. They arrive in large groups and this is not only decimating our local deer population, that our local residents depend on for food security, but also tears up and litters our trails and backcountry hunting areas. Our community is being especially hit hard because of its easy access by ferry. Some of these large groups of non-local hunters arrive with proxy tags and take large numbers of deer. One group, waiting to board the ferry back to the mainland, were overheard saying they had harvested 50 deer. Local hunters have found campsites littered with discarded plastic tarps and refuse. If you look at the trails using the Kodiak Borough GIS lands viewer you will see they have become severely torn up, with numerous muddy rutted side trails spread across meadows. We have had two recent severe winters that have reduced the local deer population, and the pressure from mainland ATV groups is having a significant negative impact on our local residents food security.



Anna Deal
Palmer, Alaska

Opposition to the Proposal to Delay Implementation of Amended Prop 204

I am writing to ask that the Board of Game **reject any proposal to delay implementation of Unit 19C sheep hunting closure for non-resident hunters for five years** that they passed at the March meeting in Soldotna after rigorous public testimony.

I fully support the Board decision at the March Meeting to amend Proposition 204 to restrict non-resident sheep hunting in unit 19C, while leaving it open to resident hunting.

Closure of 19C to non-resident hunting is long past due.

We are in this position today because of the failure to place ANY limits on non-resident hunters. Restrictions must be placed on the group taking 90% of the sheep: non-resident hunters, not on Alaska residents. Non-residents should have been limited to a drawing-only permit system long ago. Now, the Board argues, there are too few sheep to justify even a drawing allotment for non-resident guided hunts.

There is no benefit to delaying a closure to commercial sheep hunting in unit 19C. A delay will only incentivize a "get them while you can" attitude.

Until forced to change, guides will continue to sell hunts to non-resident hunters and to take as many rams as they can because "if they don't, someone else will". While closure is understandably painful, it will be just as uncomfortable in the future as it is now while continuing to put damaging pressure on a declining sheep population. Guides have enjoyed the luxury and financial benefit of no restrictions and it is long past time to manage their impact. Immediate closure of 19C to non-resident hunting is now urgently warranted.

Guides have made no serious attempt to adjust their business plan based on the declining sheep population or passage of proposal 204. This indicates that they feel confident that they can persuade the Board to accommodate their wants. If successful, the chance of commercial guiding interests resorting to the same tactic again year after year is very high.

This call for a special meeting to delay implementation of proposal 204 is clearly the result of pressure from commercial guiding interests and is the direct result of having massively disproportionate representation by guides on the Board: 5 commercial guides and 1 retired guide on a 7 member board.

It subverts the public process, favors minority special interests, rewards stubbornness, and fails to do the job that the Board is tasked to do, which is to manage the sheep population for the benefit of Alaskans.

Decisions were made during an open public process. Changing those decisions now through a process that won't allow for the same public input is undermines the legitimacy of the Board.

If a sound-minded resolution and strategy to restore the sheep population to historic numbers for the benefit of Alaskans is abandoned as a result of bending to pressure from guides and out of state hunting interests, then the Board needs to be restructured to better represent Alaska residents and manage wildlife resources.



At the risk of repeating myself, I have included my Public Comment to the Board of Game March 2023 meeting explaining the rationale for limiting non-resident hunting in unit 19C below:

Anna Deal – Palmer Alaska

Proposal 204 – Oppose as Written (March 17th, 2023)

My name is Anna Deal. My husband, 4 children and I have a family hunting camp in unit 19C. I have grown up hunting there, and we have recently lived there year-round working remotely and homeschooling our children. We are highly vested in the area and resident sheep population.

I oppose proposal 204 as written, with a full closure of unit 19C to all sheep hunting. To go from no limits to full closure is rash, unnecessary, and unfairly penalizes resident hunters.

However, I do support action that would place limits on non-resident hunting.

In my opinion, we are in the position we are today because of the failure to place a limit on non-resident hunters. Restrictions should be placed on the group taking 90% of the sheep: non-resident hunters, not on Alaska residents. Non-residents should have been limited to a drawing-only permit system long ago.

I would support a limited permit or drawing system for non-residents while keeping it open to resident hunters, and especially resident youth hunters for the following reasons:

1. **Allowing for unlimited harvest of full curl rams is not a sustainable management practice.** **Mature rams have value to the group beyond their breeding ability.** Anyone who has ever watched a group of rams knows how much the young ones rely on the experience of the older rams for guidance. A group of 3-5 rams moves as an infantry with a forward and rear flank. When they rest, rams set up so that all vulnerable approaches to their position are covered. When the only older ram is taken or a group of rams is reduced to less than 2-3 individuals, they can not offer each other as much protection and the remaining young rams are much more vulnerable to predation. They're downright lost, dumb, and senseless without the older ram. Rams in 19C can live for several more years by the time they reach full curl. The rams we have taken (beyond full curl), all but one still had good dentition, all were fat and healthy.
2. **The current unlimited system incentivizes guides to take every legal ram that they can find for as many non-resident hunters as possible.** At \$25k per hunt, a non-resident hunter expects to get a sheep. From the guide's perspective, if they don't take it, another guide and client will. They are not wrong. There is no incentive to leave a healthy full-curl ram to reach trophy size or to "self-regulate" when the population declines. We have watched the non-resident guided hunting pressure increase year after year. More permits for non-permanent structures, more remote landing strips, more air traffic, more non-resident hunters, and fewer sheep every year. Guided hunters are extremely effective at taking sheep: 90% of sheep killed last year being taken by non-resident guided hunters.
3. **Resident hunters are driven by different priorities and are much more likely to "self-regulate".** Resident hunters are much more likely not to take sheep when the sheep population declines. We see the trends and self-regulate to let the population rebound because we want the sheep to be there for our kids. We are not motivated by getting a sheep as much as getting out to hunt with our family and to foster an appreciation for hunting and the resident sheep population we



have come to know in the next generation. We want to be able to hunt with our family year after year, but not necessarily take a sheep every year.

- I can't tell you how disheartening it is to watch my daughter hike her tail off with me for a week, then decide to pass on a ram that is legal, but healthy and young enough to live another year so that it can get really big or continue to be the mentor for the younger rams, only to have a non-resident hunter fly in, land on a mountain top, and take it within days.
- I have grown up hunting sheep in 19C with my 1st hunt at 12 years old with the agreement with my dad that we would not shoot anything. I went on several hunts, but did not kill a sheep until I was 35.
- In the last 20 years, my family and I have hunted sheep almost every season in 19C, but we have only taken 4 sheep between us. We have passed on far more nice legal rams than we have taken.
- As a youth hunter, my daughter passed on 3 beautiful rams before she was twelve.
- Our son went on 5 hunts before getting a nice ram at 11 years old.

4. **Resident youth hunting grows the next generation of Alaska sportsmen/women and should be left open.** The youth hunt has become a "right of passage" for our kids. Our 9 year old and 5 year old daughters are looking forward to their 10th birthdays when they will be eligible to be the hunter for the youth hunt. They know that they will likely only take one nice ram in their lifetime, so there is no rush to take the first legal ram that they see. Sheep hunting with kids is an incredible experience and extremely difficult to be successful. I suspect there would be very few rams taken per year if left open, but would allow Alaskan youth to continue to hunt and to be vested in the sheep of 19C.
5. **An honest discussion must acknowledge that there are many factors at play in the declining sheep population:** hard winters, a rebounding wolf population, black and grizzly bear predation, golden eagle predation on lambs, as well as resident and non-resident hunting pressure. Full closure to all hunting may not have as much impact on the sheep population as we hope given the magnitude of the other factors. **With non-resident hunters taking 90% of the sheep, closure to resident hunting is likely to have the least impact of all.**
6. **A very limited permit-system rather than full closure to non-residents would allow resident guides to continue to maintain their livelihoods.** Non-resident hunting in 19C has without a doubt gotten out of hand, but full closure would be very painful. Limiting non-residents to a few sheep per season would increase the value of each hunt & allow guides to continue to operate.

I strongly urge the board to reject proposal 204 as written, to place reasonable limits on non-resident hunters with a drawing permit system, and to allow resident and resident youth hunting to continue. If, in the next few seasons, resident hunters abuse that system, then I would also support a once in a decade limit on sheep for resident hunters.

If the Board votes to approve proposal 204 with closure to hunting for all parties, then upon re-opening, non-resident hunters must be capped with a drawing permit system. A full closure to everyone for 5 years, followed by full opening to non-residents would put us right back where we started.

Respectfully,
Anna Deal



PC30

Submitted by: Doug Dorner

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, AK

Comment:

Hi, I strongly oppose delaying the implementation of Proposal 73. This was already adopted by the board with public input and testimony. Implementing this does prevent anyone from being able to hunt in the 2023 regulatory year, it just sets a limit.

Thank you

Doug Dorner



PC31

Submitted by: Ben Dubbe

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Homer, AK

Comment:

This comment is in response to the possible generation of board of game proposals to change the implementation of proposal 204 affecting the sheep season in 19c.

I am strongly opposed to changing the implementation of proposal 204. Especially because it would require the unethical step of requiring a board generated proposal.

This is not how the board of game is designed to work. It sets a horrible precedent for the board of game to cave into political pressure after the public process has run its course. It is not the job of the board of game to one-sidedly decide they know best and play the role of dictator. A board of game proposal has its place, but this is not it.

The facts about the sheep numbers and harvest in 19c are nothing new and no surprise. There is no new information available that was not available before the public board of game process ran its course.

Nonresident hunters have been harvesting the overwhelming majority of sheep in 19c for a very long time. They have been over-harvesting for a very long time. Because of outsized influence from the outfitting sector and a variety of factors, internal and external, ADF&G and the board of game has done nothing about it.

The issue of declining sheep population finally came to a head and a hard decision was made during the regulatory process.

The ban on nonresident hunters in 19c during the year their hunts were already booked is not a good situation. However, although I feel for the hunters and the outfitters who are losing out, it was necessary and long overdue. When you kick the can down the road for so long, you are not left with good options.

Thank you for your consideration



PC32

Submitted by: Lee Duet

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Bogue Chitto Mississippi

Comment:

I know of multiple hunters including myself that were planning on going to Kodiak in next year or so and now with the 1 deer limit for NR we are not gonna end up going. Hard to justify the cost, travel logistics etc to go for 1 deer. Doesn't need to be 3 but if limits were 2 it would make all the difference in world. Thanks Lee



PC33

Submitted by: Daniel Ender

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cayucos, CA

Comment:

Dear Alaska Dept of Fish and Game,

I oppose the implementation of Prop 73 as it does not have any biological reason to it. The implementation of the proposition is not grounded in science. This will hurt the revenue of the state and tourism industry. Additionally, a bag limit of at least two deer allows a hunter to continue hunting after harvesting a deer early in their trip, even if they don't intend to harvest another animal.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts.

Best,

Danny Ender



PC34

Submitted by: Matthew Ericksen

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Waddell, Arizona

Comment:

I Appose proposal 73

There is no scientific basis to limit the Buck harvest for non-residents since, non residents average just a little over 1 Buck per hunter, I planned my hunt over 2 years ago due to the wait to hunt on Kodiak and would not have scheduled it if I was only allowed one buck. Alaska Game and Fish will loose a lot of Non resident income on un used tags



PC35

Submitted by: Tim Evert

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: North Freedom WI

Comment:

Dear Sirs, Please consider delaying the one buck per non-resident for unit 8-deer.

The deer population is very good from what I understand. I will be hunting in that unit this fall, when I booked the hunt I was in the understanding I would have the ability to take 2 buck if I chose to, this was a main factor on why I booked the hunt as I am unable to do an out of state hunt (Wisconsin) very often. Thank you for considering! Tim



PC36

Submitted by: Jarrett Finley

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Palmer, Alaska

Comment:

My comment is in regards to Unit 8 deer.

I'm unapologetically an Alaskan resident who wants to put Alaskans first over non-residents. The opportunity for non-residents to hunt Kodiak is still there with a 1 deer limit but hopefully this limit will reduce the number of non-resident boat based hunters. I have hunted late season Kodiak for over 20 years and the past several years I have seen a huge increase in transporters dropping off non-residents hunters (I talk with them!) on the beaches. Often times close to camps already set up in the area. These transporters are getting guys out wherever they can, to shoot everything they can, to get lots of pictures of their boats covered in deer, foxes and ducks.

I sincerely hope non-residents will always have the opportunity to hunt Kodiak but not at the expense of the Alaskan residents experience. Other states prioritize residents over non-residents, why can't ALASKA prioritize ALASKANS? I hope the board does NOT reverse their decision.



PC37

Submitted by: Jordan Fogle

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

Greetings,

My name is Jordan Fogle and I was born and raised here in Kodiak. In addition to growing up here, I've hunted and fished on this beautiful island my entire life. I support the limit change in Kodiak because I believe it's fair and gives the deer a chance to thrive with the recent harsh winters we've been having and the increased amounts of hunting pressure (primarily the non resident and transport hunters).

As someone that grew up here, I've seen Kodiak change a lot over the years and one of the biggest changes I've seen is the deer populations. When I was in my teens, it was rare for myself and the people in my hunting party to encounter another group of hunters. Now a days, when my hunting party and I go hunting off the road system we see transport hunters EVERYWHERE. Locations that used to have high populations of deer now are a shadow of what it used to be with the increased amounts of pressure the transporters have brought to Kodiak. If this continues Kodiak will become a washed-up land unless we take action and I believe reducing the limit for non residents to one deer is a good step in the right direction. To conclude this matter, I want to say thank you for everything you do for this great state. Take care!

- Jordan



Submitted by: Paul Forward

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Girdwood, AK

Comment:

see attached



The purpose of this comment is to strongly OPPOSE any reversal of the passing of **Proposal 204**. To clarify, I am in favor of maintaining the closure for non-resident hunters.

Alternatively, I would also be strongly in favor of modifying the proposal to make 19c Full Curl by **Bow and Arrow Only** for both resident and non-resident hunters as a compromise that would allow everyone to hunt but still decrease harvest significantly.

Furthermore, this process of reversing decisions made through the public process (on both unit 8 and 19c) does not seem consistent with the Proposal process as it is intended.

Context:

I have been an avid hunter in Alaska since 1991 and, particularly over the past 5-10 years have paid careful attention to the status of sheep populations and sheep hunting in Alaska. I have spent many hours in the offices of and on the phone with sheep biologists and have even taken part in several podcasts and other discussions about the current state of our sheep populations and the causes thereof. Similarly, I recently attended the Wild Sheep Foundation Sheep Show and was both in attendance and contributed to the conversation during the Alaska Dall Sheep Strategy Meeting on January 12. The overwhelming conclusion from all of the biologists and other scientific experts with whom I've spoken and whose papers I've read is that the decline we're seeing in 19c and elsewhere is strongly related to (anthropogenic) climate change. According to every major scientific organization including IUCN (of which the Wild Sheep Foundation is a member) is that process will not stop and that we can only expect worsening in the future. This is, therefore, very different than previous weather-related sheep population declines.

With that in mind, there is concern that even harvesting Full Curl only rams may not be an adequate strategy. According to data from British Columbia, eliminating old, experienced breeding rams is correlated with decreased mating attempts by the remaining younger rams. On top of that, many units in Alaska, including 19c have seen an alarming trend toward younger rams being harvested as well as the mature ones. ADFG statistics from 2020 and 2021 showed average age of harvest at well under 8 years old and many of the young rams harvested are killed by guided hunters. With success rates in the 50-80% range for non-resident hunters and non-resident hunters accounting for 90% of the unit 19c harvest overall, it's apparent that a significant reduction in overall ram harvest would likely be a step in the right direction toward conserving what sheep we have left, especially with climate change that will only worsen in the future.

We must act now to conserve Alaska's sheep population and creating a moratorium on non-resident sheep harvest seems a very good place to start.

Archery:

As discussed by one of the board members at the March meeting in Soldotna, one very reasonable alternative that would provide all of the benefits of the moratorium without the financial detriment to outfitters would simply be to change 19c to **Archery Only** for all sheep hunters. Archery hunts have been used very effectively as management tools throughout the lower 48 and Canada including for sheep (Alberta and BC have archery only areas that have proved popular and effective and are very well received).

As noted above, the success rate for non-resident hunting in these areas has been as high as 80% over the past 5 years and is consistently over 40% for resident hunters. These are



extremely high success rates, higher than those for many other species in many parts of the state. Transitioning this area to archery hunting would allow for true fair chase hunting with decreased success rates but will maintain opportunity for **anyone** who wants to hunt it (they would just use a bow now). Skilled hunters who know how to pursue and stalk sheep will still kill rams but the overall take will be reduced due the increased difficulty. **This is the best possible strategy to MAINTAIN OPPORTUNITY for all while DECREASING HARVEST significantly and would beautifully accomplish the goal of the moratorium while still allowing outfitters to remain financially viable and non-resident hunters to enjoy their hunts.**

***Regarding opportunity: In the past there has been some resistance to transitioning existing rifle hunts into archery hunts because of the perception of some that this somehow decreases opportunity. It is, however, well established throughout the United States and in Alaska that all hunters are capable of taking advantage of archery hunts by the simple means of purchasing and learning to shoot a bow. Those who wish to sheep hunt in 19c who are not already among the thousands of Alaskans who enjoy bowhunting, can easily obtain equipment and proficiency. Currently it's possible to buy an effective hunting bow for less than the cost of most rifles and to learn to shoot accurately in a matter of weeks. **This change will not adversely affect any hunters opportunity, it will just make the hunt a little more challenging and thereby decrease total harvest.**

***Of note, in the past there has been some resistance to transitioning existing rifle hunts into archery hunts because of the perception of some that this somehow decreases opportunity. It is, however, well established throughout the United States and in Alaska that all hunters are capable of taking advantage of archery hunts by the simple means of purchasing and layering to shoot a bow. Currently it's possible to buy an effective hunting bow for less than the cost of most rifles and to learn to shoot accurately in a matter of weeks. **Implementing this now, in May, would give non-resident hunters who don't already hunt with archery equipment but who have booked hunts, more than ample time to purchase a bow and learn to effectively shoot it.** With modern archery equipment requisite shooting proficiency can easily be accomplished in this timeframe.

***Precedent: There are examples, both in and outside Alaska of the success of archery only sheep areas. In In Alaska, DS140/141 and DS240/241, which are bowhunting only draw hunts for any ram in an easily accessible area, the success rate over a ten-year period was about 2 – 3 rams per year for almost 70 tags awarded each year, and only a small fraction of the rams that were killed in these hunts would be considered legal in a full curl only area. Specifically, in the Eklutna area, where almost 70 hunters per year are allowed to bow hunt *for any*



ram in an easily accessible area, there is still a steady population of mature rams despite all the hunting pressure. This is an example of how archery hunting allows for tremendous amounts of hunting opportunity with minimal impact on the animal population.

Similarly, there are very popular and well accepted hunts in Canada including the Canmore "Bow Zone" and the Todagin Mountain area of British Columbia. Both are over the counter archery sheep hunts that have proven popular with hunters and very effective in expanding hunter opportunity while having minimal harvest affect.

Language for a possible archery solution:

The current regulation for August 10-September 20 readsL

R: One ram with full-curl horn or larger

NR: One ram with full-curl horn or larger every four regulatory years

The proposal here would change that language to:

R: One ram with full-curl horn or larger *by bow and arrow only*.

NR: One ram with full-curl horn or larger every four regulatory years *by bow and arrow only*.



PC39

Submitted by: Gavin Frese

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Quincy, IL

Comment:

Reversal of the proposed reduced bag limit for Non-residents of Sitka deer on Kodiak Island should be strongly considered from various perspectives.

Most importantly, biologically. Biologists concur that deer populations vary significantly from year to year and are primarily based on the previous year's harshness of winter. Reducing the bag limit by 2 tags would not have as great of an effect on the population as the conditions the deer are susceptible to.

Secondly, the financial aspect of reducing the bag limit for Sitka deer would affect Alaskan wildlife and tourism as well as the Non-resident consumer. Reducing the bag limit would cause monetary-induced cancellations of planned excursions to the state. For many, the deer tag is the most economical of the big game fees making it an attractive species to hunt for. Reduction of the bag limit would make taking a trip to Alaska less worthwhile although money is wanting to be spent in the state.

For these reasons, suspending the Non-resident reduction may be worth considering. Monitoring the population in relation to the winter conditions while keeping the bag limit at 3 may be a worthwhile plan until the populations show demise from hunting efforts.

Your efforts in wildlife preservation are applauded by all including those from the lower 48.

Thank you



PC40

Submitted by: Ben Genz

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Onalaska, WI

Comment:

I am writing you today to ask you to reconsider the recent decision to reduce NR deer tags from 3 to 1. I have a hunting trip booked with 3 other NR hunters from Wisconsin. From what I have been able to find, this reduction is not being done for biological reasons. If the scientific data shows this reduction is necessary then I would begrudgingly support the reduction. However, this has caused some of the others in my group to reconsider the trip as the cost is difficult to justify for 1 deer. Obviously this would be a negative for the individuals and businesses who benefit from NR hunters coming to the island.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ben Genz



PC41

Submitted by: Craig Germond

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cheyenne WY

Comment:

I'm a nonresident hunter and have enjoyed hunting AK on many occasions. I'm a Bowhunter. I've hunted Sitka deer twice on Kodiak. I feel with the expense making this trip a nonresident hunter should be allowed two tags minimum. I feel this isn't being greedy on the deer tags. I'm aware that the state of Alaska doesn't need to guarantee a tag, but the revenue nonresidents bring to the table is beneficial the state and local businesses. I'm not really sure the basis for the proposal. Your reconsideration on this proposal would be greatly appreciated.



PC42

Submitted by: Josh Good

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Kodiak, Alaska

Comment:

As a resident of Kodiak, I and my family depend upon the access to Kodiak Sitka Blacktail deer. The Alaska state constitution guarantees the residence of our state access to the resources of our state. This should take precedence over access to our resources from outside interests and non-residents. If hunting access for non-residence continues to increase like it has over the last several years, paired with a population, damaging winter, or other event in nature, the deer populations will not be of the magnitude where residents of Kodiak can depend upon them as a resource for a winters supply of wild meat. Please support the limiting of non-residents to the take of a single deer per year in unit eight



PC43

Submitted by: Karen Gordon

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Fairbanks, AK

Comment:

To Board of Game Members:

Please delay any action or implementation of the 19C mistake-laden decision in your May 25 meeting. The Board must follow the Constitution and statutes and consider data from the Department in making its decisions. It has failed to do so and must reconsider its action on 19C until it has met those mandated requirements.



“Board-generated” Proposal

Proposal 204 should never have been created as it was based on fabrication, not facts. There was no conservation concern to address, only created fears.

Emotionally-driven Proposal

Without supporting documentation or data, the Board chose to close nonresident hunting in GMU 19C with no justification other than a tearful plea by a Board Member. The Board has no directive to make decisions based on emotion.

Economic Impact Ignored

The Board failed to consider the economic impact of precluding nonresident hunting in GMU 19C. Attached is a spreadsheet of five years’ data I compiled before the weather event of last year and before COVID when populations and hunter efforts were “normal” that show the difference between the contribution to the Fish and Game Fund of residents versus nonresidents. Residents purchase a hunting license for \$45 while nonresidents pay \$1100 for that same right to hunt. A nonresident pays 24 times what a resident pays for the same opportunity to hunt sheep in 19C. In average years sheep hunting residents with the Pittman/Robertson match contribute \$18,000 per year while nonresidents contribute \$367,000 per year. Given what nonresident sheep hunters contribute to the Fish and Game Fund, it would take over 2400 more Alaska residents paying \$45 each just in 19C to compensate for the loss of nonresident hunter revenue caused by the Board’s arbitrary closure.

The Board Ignored the Expert Scientists in Making Its Decision

The Board asked the Department about the state of sheep last fall which was provided publicly and to the Board last October by [REDACTED]. They reported there was no conservation concern regarding sheep because low numbers are due to weather events and populations will likely rebound as they have in the past. The biologists’ report was ignored by the Board twice solely in favor of an emotional plea to save the sheep that totally ignored the Constitution, the statutes, and the opinion of professional biologists. In fact, the situation in Units 7 and 15 with sheep is more concerning, but the Board was inconsistent by leaving full curl hunting there but in 19C where the perceived problem was not nearly as bad, the Board decided to close all nonresident hunting. Why? There was NO basis to justify this decision. The Board should just maintain the status quo on hunting in 19C with the protective full curl management regime which is self-protecting to the population and not limit any hunting opportunity.

Sincerely,

Karen Gordon

Fairbanks



Average GMU 19C Sheep Harvest Data 2015-2019						
Status	Successful	%	Unsuccessful	%	Total Hunters	
Resident	38	36%	61	73%	100	
Non Res	68	66%	23	27%	91	
Total	106				190	

Average Annual 19C Sheep Nonresident Contribution	
Hunting License	\$ 160.00
Harvest Tag	\$ 850.00
Total	\$ 1,010.00
91 x \$1010= \$ 91,910.00	
With P/R Match	\$ 367,640.00

Average Annual 19C Sheep Resident Fiscal Contribution	
Hunting License	\$ 45.00
Total	\$ 45.00
100 x \$45= \$ 4,500.00	
With P/R Match	\$ 18,000.00

Total Contributions Resident and Nonresident	
Resident %	5%
Nonresident %	95%
Total Contributions Resident and Nonresident	\$ 385,640.00

GMU 19 Sheep Harvest Data						
Year	Status	Successful	%	Unsuccessful	%	Total Hunters
2015	Resident	34	35%	69	73%	103
	Non Res	63	66%	25	27%	88
	Total	97		94		191
2016	Resident	34	35%	51	66%	85
	Non Res	62	66%	26	34%	88
	Total	96		77		173
2017	Resident	46	43%	60	78%	106
	Non Res	61	66%	17	22%	78
	Total	107		77		184
2018	Resident	39	33%	68	71%	107
	Non Res	79	66%	28	29%	107
	Total	118		96		214
2019	Resident	39	34%	58	76%	97
	Non Res	75	66%	18	24%	93
	Total	114		76		190

Note: For calculation purposes I have selected the annual hunting license fee for resident and nonresident, and for the nonresident I did not include any alien fees, so these figures underreport the actual nonresident contribution.



PC44

Submitted by: James Goss

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Middleburg, PA

Comment:

I regularly hunt Kodiak and have not notice any decline in deer numbers. I think the reduction in tags in not warranted. It is political and not based on deer numbers at all!



PC45

Submitted by: Adam Grenda

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: King Salmon, AK

Comment:

I do not think we should be allowing non resident hunters in 19c for the next five years to hunt sheep. They have been taking the majority of the rams out of that unit for many years. We need to let the sheep population rebound some and then reassess in 5 years. With a declining herd there needs to be a change made. I feel as a resident of the state and due to Article 8 of our states constitution that my family who lives here year round should get a preference to hunt those animals over the non residents.

Thank you



PC46

Submitted by: Aric Groshong

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Roseburg, OR

Comment:

Dear Board members,

I have recently learned that there is a proposal to decrease the bag limit for nonresidents hunting sitka blacktail on Kodiak island from 3 to 1. I booked my trip with Homer Ocean Charters over a year ago with the game management rule in place that I would be allowed to harvest 3 deer, so finding out that this has been decreased after investing a significant amount of money is at the very least disappointing. In addition to not being as attractive of a hunting option, the proposed changes decrease revenue generated by tag sales, float/bush plane and boat charter fees, as well as other monies hunters invest in

the communities they visit. I encourage you to reconsider this proposal, and at the very least, do not invoke the rule until all currently booked trips have passed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aric Groshong



PC47

Submitted by: Kyle Hampton

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Anchorage, AK

Comment:

I'm concerned about the motivation and intention of this measure. I understand that the residents of Kodiak feel a sense of ownership for the animals and hunting habits of the island; this price on the land is what makes it so unique and wild. To balance, we need to make sure the limits and regulations are biologically driven, not emotionally driven. If the biological indicators for the population on Kodiak suggest overharvest or the threat of it, that should determine deer limits; I want to see the data and supporting evidence for deer populations. I would like to, and do, hunt in places beyond where I immediately live; I also want to hunt in places that are sustainably managed, not on the verge of collapse.

Allowing the public to hunt these remote destinations and appreciate their beauty fosters support and protection. Without the broad public's support for these wild places, the pristine places could be impacted by much more than just a few more hunters coming to the island than some folks want. I'm worried this sets a dangerous precedent for regulation based on emotional drivers, not biological drivers.



PC48

Submitted by: Nathan Hannah

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Wasilla

Comment:

In regards to the proposals it is sad to see that when there is finally action from the Board that benefits Alaskan wildlife (sheep in particular) that the process is circumvented to bend a knee to outside interest. It is high time the BOG gets it right and protects ALASKAN resources for ALASKANS and uses the power within their means accordingly. Simple math here, Non-res are harvesting the majority so they must be restricted regardless of the cause for the population decline (most likely climate change). This step must be enacted before further restricting residents of the state. For non-res guides and hunters alike I have one piece of advice, pay your dues and become a resident where you actually contribute to our community or go hunt Canada or better yet your home state.



PC49

Submitted by: Kyle Hanson

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Iowa City, Iowa

Comment:

Good afternoon,

I am writing you here today because I am opposed to the change in bag limit of Blacktail Deer in Unit 8 of Alaska for Non-resident Hunters.

Kodiak Island has a sustainable population of Deer for Non-residents such as myself, to hunt. By changing the bag limit from 3 to 1, it unnecessary punishes those who value the resource and bring income & revenue to the State of Alaska.

The change was very sudden and a surprise to many hunters such as myself. The change seems to be driven by social conflict not due to deer numbers being concerned. If there was scientific or biological justification to reduce the harvest then I would support the change. Thats just not the case here.

I humbly ask, please reconsider this decision. Please reverse the action taken or at least consider a more reasonable compromise so we all can still utilize the resource within reason.

Thank you very much for your consideration and reading my comments.



PC50

Submitted by: Westly Hart

Organization Name:

Community of Residence: Cody, WY

Comment:

Dear Board Of Game Members,

I strongly support the delay of Proposal 73. I had planned on booking my first outfitted Sitka deer hunt on Kodiak Island a few weeks before I heard about this proposal, and I have been looking forward to harvesting multiple bucks during my adventure in September 2023.

If I am limited to only one deer tag, I will not book my hunt. It would be too expensive to fly to Alaska from Wyoming for only one buck. For me, the main appeal of hunting deer in Alaska is the chance to bag two or three bucks. I can obtain one deer tag in many places a lot closer to home.

I am grateful the board is considering a delay of the one-buck rule on Kodiak. This will let me realize my dream of hunting deer in your great state.

Sincerely,

Westly Hart
