

Alaska Board of Game

RC2: Advisory Committee and Public Comments

**Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery,
and Ambler Road**

Fairbanks, AK | July 22-23, 2026

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

Compilation of Comments submitted before 8:00 a.m. on 7/16/2025, sorted alphabetically, with a “PC number”. Any comments submitted after 8:00 a.m. on 7/16/2025 will be posted on the meeting webpage as Record Copies (RCs).

Advisory Committee Index

Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee	AC1
Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee.....	AC2

Public Committee Index

Multiple Submitters	PC1
Nick Adler	PC2
James Akenson.....	PC3
Alaska Outdoor Council	PC4
Alaskan Bowhunters Association.....	PC5
Ambler Metals LLC	PC6
Arctic Beringia Program, Wildlife Conservation Society.....	PC7
Kevin Bahr	PC8
Mike Barrett.....	PC9
Douglas Borland.....	PC10
Bob Bosman	PC11
Terry Bowling	PC12
Cody Brandes	PC13
Bryan Burkhardt.....	PC14
Cody Butkiewicz	PC15

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road**

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

Jack Caddell.....	PC16
Patrick Cebuhar.....	PC17
Santa Claus.....	PC18
Todd Clyncke.....	PC19
Marvin Clyncke.....	PC20
Beck Coggeshall.....	PC21
Eric Cooper.....	PC22
Todd Craig.....	PC23
Jack Culpepper.....	PC24
Winston Davies.....	PC25
William DeWoody.....	PC26
Temple Dillard.....	PC27
Toby Dobson.....	PC28
Doyon, Limited.....	PC29
Ben Dubbe.....	PC30
Roger Dunbar.....	PC31
Jeffry Evans.....	PC32
Dan Evenson.....	PC33
Tad Farmer.....	PC34
Preston Farrior, Ferman Motor Car Co.....	PC35
Charles Feldmann.....	PC36
Jeff Finn.....	PC37
Patrick Finney.....	PC38

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

John Frost.....	PC39
Christopher Gibbons.....	PC40
Bradley Golden.....	PC41
John Haines.....	PC42
Karl Hall, Nashville Sportsman.....	PC43
Kathy Harris.....	PC44
Mary Hausler.....	PC45
Tony Heil.....	PC46
Isaac Henry.....	PC47
Robert Hidding, Blackhawk Molding.....	PC48
Bruce Hoch.....	PC49
Paul Hopkins.....	PC50
Gerald Hunter.....	PC51
Indiana Bowhunters Association.....	PC52
Chris Jasmine, Compton Traditional Bowhunters.....	PC53
Josh Jenkins.....	PC54
Tom Jenkins, Professional Bowhunters Society.....	PC55
Larry Jones.....	PC56
Thom Jorgensen.....	PC57
David Joyce.....	PC58
David Kabella.....	PC59
David Kauzlarich.....	PC60
Dan Keleher.....	PC61

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

John Kleinsmith, Alaska Bowhunters	PC62
Grant Kopplin	PC63
Duane Krones, Professional Bowhunters Society	PC64
Tony Lail, Compton Traditional Bowhunters	PC65
Zachary Larsen	PC66
Joe Lasch	PC67
Raymond Latty, Compton	PC68
Raymond Lyon.....	PC69
Kevin Mackie, Professional Bowhunters Society	PC70
Joe Marsala Jr.....	PC71
Randall Martin, Compton traditional bowhunters	PC72
Carol Mauch	PC73
Steve McCloskey	PC74
Kathleen Menke.....	PC75
Professional Bowhunters Society	PC76
Stephen Meyers	PC77
Michael Mitten, Compton Traditional Bowhunting	PC78
Matt Moore.....	PC79
William Moran	PC80
Jason Morrison.....	PC81
NANA Regional Corporation	PC82
Josh Nash	PC83
Ron Niziolek	PC84

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME**Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road**Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

Scott Nolletti, Compton Traditional Bowhunters	PC85
Northern Alaska Chapter of SCI	PC86
Northern Alaska Environmental Center.....	PC87
Tim Novak	PC88
Anthony O'Neill	PC89
John Peeler.....	PC90
Mark Phillips.....	PC91
Steven Philp	PC92
Benjamin Pinney	PC93
Steven Pitsch	PC94
Ryan Plummer	PC95
Andy Ponce	PC96
Pope and Young Club	PC97
Tyson Porter	PC98
Justin Powell	PC99
George Reel.....	PC100
Robert Reiman	PC101
Resident Hunters of Alaska.....	PC102
Tyler Riley.....	PC103
Ronald Roberts.....	PC104
Don Roepke.....	PC105
John Romans III	PC106
Tara Russo	PC107

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

Jim Sackett	PC108
Philip Schlaegel III	PC109
Cy Sneed.....	PC110
Jay Spongberg	PC111
Rick Steiner	PC112
Dylan Steinmetz	PC113
Tim Stocklin	PC114
Trad bow hunters of alaska	PC115
Kneeland Taylor	PC116
Don Thomas	PC117
Donald Thompson	PC118
Craig Van Arsdale	PC119
Clay Vernon	PC120
Michael Vigueria	PC121
Gerald Wansack	PC122
Dave Weaver, The Alaskan Bowhunters Association	PC123
Gene Wensel	PC124
Patrick White.....	PC125
David Wildenstein	PC126
Rick Wildermuth	PC127
Russell Wilkins.....	PC128
Ray Woodruff	PC129
Jerry Yarrington.....	PC130

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler
Road**

Fairbanks, Alaska | July 22-23, 2026

Comment Index

Rodney York PC131

Todd Zeuske PC132

Fairbanks Fish & Game Advisory Committee
June 24, 2026
Special Online Meeting

I. **Call to Order:** 5:35pm by Chairman Lewellyn

II. **Roll Call**

Members Present: Levi Lewellyn, Mark Richards, James Paine, Eric Anslinger, Virgil Umphenour, John Wisniewski, Gabe Davis, Krystal Lapp, Chuck Derrick, Mike Tinker, Gale Vick. Lance Nelson joined the meeting at 5:37 p.m. Jacques Etcheverry joined during the proposal discussion and was present for voting beginning with Proposal 2)

Members Absent (Excused): John Haddix, Julia Hnilicka, Warren Giuchici,

Members Absent (Unexcused): None recorded.

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8. A quorum was present.

List of User Groups Present: Alaska Outdoor Council (AOC), Northern Alaska Environmental Center (NAEC).

III. **Fish and Game Staff Present:**

- Ryan Scott- Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation, ADF&G
- Mark Nelson- Area Biologist, Fairbanks, GMU 25(A,B,D), 26(B,C), Division of Wildlife Conservation, ADF&G
- Matt Olson- Fall Season Area Management Biologist, Yukon Area Salmon, Division of Commercial Fisheries, ADF&G
- Deena Jallen- Summer Season Area Management Biologist, Yukon Area, Division of Commercial Fisheries, ADF&G
- Lindsay Dreese- Fairbanks Assistant Area Biologist, ADF&G
- Zach Liller - AYK Regional Research Coordinator, Division of Commercial Fisheries, ADF&G
- Leila Williams- Regional Coordinator, ADF&G Boards Support / Advisory Committees

IV. **Guests Present:** Jennifer Yuhas, Diane and Lenny Jewkes, Rod Arno, Ernie Weiss (Anchorage AC), Brooke McDavid (Office of Subsistence Management/Eastern Interior RAC), Al Barrette (Board of Game), Dave Lorrington (Board of Game), Carri Ann Mueller (Board of Game), Sean Busby (Wiseman), Heidi and Scott Schoppenhorst (Wiseman), Steve (Wiseman), Ella Van Wyk (NAEC intern)

V. **Approval of Agenda:** Eric Anslinger moved to approve the agenda; Gabe Davis seconded. The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

- VI. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:** James Paine moved to approve the April 8, 2026, meeting minutes; the motion was seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent, with clarification that the AC took no action on the Mark Lindberg Dalton Highway archery-distance proposal idea and did not submit it as an AC proposal.
- VII. **New Business:** The Fairbanks AC met to discuss 4 proposals before the Board of Game at their special July 22-23 meeting, and a Federal Subsistence Board proposal (WSA 26-04), and get a fisheries update from Gale Vick.

BOG Proposal 1- Reauthorize a non-intensive management predator control plan for muskox in Unit 26B

Action: Support

Vote: 12 support, 0 oppose

Vote type: Unanimous consent, no roll call. The chair asked for unanimous support and asked members to speak up or raise their hand if there were objections. No objections were heard. Mark Richards confirmed the vote count with Chair Lewellyn as 12 yes, 0 nays

Discussion Summary: ADF&G staff explained that Proposal 1 would reauthorize a non-intensive predator control plan for muskox in Unit 26B. Mark Nelson said ADF&G used a similar authorization from 2011 to 2016 after bears were documented taking muskox. During the prior effort, ADF&G took seven bears total over the project period. He said the current proposal would be similar, limited to a few bears, and would remain within the harvestable surplus. He also reported that ADF&G had collared one large adult male bear that came out of the den in spring 2026 and was documented killing three muskox in one day.

Committee questions focused on community input, timing, methods, and salvage. Krystal Lapp asked whether ADF&G had talked with affected communities. Mark Nelson responded that he had discussed the issue in Kaktovik and with the North Slope AC, and said feedback appeared broadly supportive. Al Barrette asked why the proposal was being handled outside the regular cycle, and ADF&G staff explained they were trying to act before additional muskox were lost to bear predation. Krystal also asked how bears would be taken and whether ADF&G intended to salvage hides, skulls, meat, or other parts. ADF&G responded that identified bears would be taken by helicopter as quickly and humanely as possible, and that staff hoped to salvage what they could, though summer conditions can make salvage difficult.

Committee discussion was generally supportive. Virgil spoke in favor of the proposal, describing bears as highly efficient predators and supporting targeted removal when specific bears are known to be taking muskox. He also discussed past predator-control efforts where bear meat was salvaged and used for jerky and sausage to show that bear meat could be used. No separate public testimony was recorded on Proposal 1. The committee then supported the proposal by unanimous consent, with 11 in support and 0 opposed.

BOG Proposal 2 - Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only

Action: Support

Vote: 13 support, 0 oppose.

Vote type: Unanimous consent, no roll-call vote.

Discussion Summary: The committee discussed Proposal 2 as a proposal to allow verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes for big game hunts restricted to archery. Mark explained that the proposal was meant to help hunters with poor near vision who have difficulty seeing pin sights. He described these devices as legal in several other states and said they help hunters see their sights without giving an unfair advantage.

Eric spoke in support and explained that the issue is not limited to older hunters. He said his son has astigmatism and that shooting with glasses affects his anchor point. He explained that a clarifier in the peep sight could help hunters with vision issues take game more effectively with archery equipment.

ADF&G staff clarified the difference between Proposal 2 and Proposal 3. Ryan Scott explained that the two proposals were similar, but Proposal 2 dealt with **non-electronic scopes**, while Proposal 3 involved electronic scopes. Clarifiers and verifiers were included in both proposals. Committee discussion focused on whether the devices would help hunters with vision limitations without increasing harvest or creating an unfair advantage. Members generally agreed that verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes could improve ethical shot placement and participation for hunters with vision challenges. No separate public testimony was recorded on Proposal 2.

BOG Proposal 3- Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only

Action: Support

Vote: 12 support, 1 oppose

Vote type: Not roll call. The chair asked whether there were objections. Mark Richards stated he would vote no and confirmed with Chair Lewellyn that there were 13 voting members present. The final vote was recorded as 12 yeas and 1 nay.

Discussion Summary: ADF&G staff explained that Proposal 3 was similar to Proposal 2, but Proposal 3 would allow electronic scopes, while Proposal 2 was limited to non-electronic scopes. Clarifiers and verifiers were included in both proposals. Ryan Scott noted that other states vary on whether electronic scopes are allowed.

Committee members asked several questions about what “electronic scopes” would include. Chuck asked what electronic scopes are capable of and how they are used. Mark Richards described non-electronic scopes as similar to rifle scopes with nothing electronic associated with them, and said electronic scopes may include electronic focus or reticle features. Eric then explained several examples, including illuminated pins that do not project light externally, red-

dot/prism-style sights, and electronic range-finding sights made by companies such as Burris and Garmin. He explained that range-finding sights can range a target and adjust holdover after the bow is set up, reducing the need to range with one hand, drop the rangefinder, and then draw. Eric said this could help on the Haul Road, where rushed or longer archery shots can lead to wounded caribou.

Dave asked whether either proposal would allow thermal, infrared, or forward-looking technology. The response was that those technologies would not be allowed under the proposals. Chuck also asked whether a red dot meant a laser projected onto an animal, and Eric clarified that it would be like a red dot or prism optic, not a projected laser.

Mike asked whether anyone knew if electronic scopes would increase the number of animals killed or wounded compared with non-electronic scopes. ADF&G did not have data specific to that question. Ryan Scott later clarified that harvest reports capture whether an animal was taken by firearm, archery, or other method, but do not track the level of technology used in the archery equipment.

Krystal asked whether internal illuminated parts would be allowed as long as they did not project light externally. Mark Richards responded that internally illuminated parts are already legal.

Committee discussion was mostly supportive. Virgil Umphenour supported the proposal, explaining that sight alignment becomes harder with age and that a lighted reticle or similar aid could help hunters align the sight to the target without projecting light. Gail Vick also supported the proposal, saying that if an electronic rangefinder could reduce waste and wounded animals, she was in favor. James Paine said the proposal appeared to combine existing legal technologies into one unit and could help hunters make more ethical shots, including on the Haul Road and in the management area for moose.

Krystal asked that members of the public in bowhunting areas be given the opportunity to comment. The chair agreed and invited public comment, but no public testimony was offered on Proposal 3. The chair then asked whether there were objections. Mark Richards voted no, stating earlier that he had a problem with Proposal 3, and the proposal passed 12-1.

BOG Proposal 4 - Close a 2-mile-wide corridor along the Ambler Road

Action: Oppose

Vote: 0 support, 13 opposed

The AC unanimously opposed Proposal 4 as drafted and recommended that the Board of Game take no action on the proposal. A separate letter was approved to explain the AC's opposition and recommendation

Vote type: Not roll call. A positive motion was made to support Proposal 4, seconded, and then the chair asked for those in favor. No members voted in favor. The chair stated the motion failed 0–13, the AC unanimously opposed Proposal 4.

Discussion Summary: The committee discussed Proposal 4 as a proposed no-hunting/no-trapping corridor along the proposed Ambler Road. The chair clarified that although the proposal had been described as a one-mile corridor, it would be one mile on each side of the road, making it a two-mile-wide corridor. Members also discussed the route map and noted that the road alignment should still be understood as a corridor/general alignment rather than a final hard line, since the final road could shift during design and field work.

Discussion focused heavily on whether a closure was needed at all because the Ambler Road is proposed as a private industrial road with locked gates and no public access. Mike Tinker argued that the MOU coordination requirement was satisfied by bringing the proposal forward for AC and public comment, but that the Board of Game should take no action because the road would already be gated with 24-hour security and only authorized users would be allowed beyond the security checkpoint. He also noted that contractors could prohibit employees and service workers from hunting, trapping, or fishing through employment policies, similar to early TAPS construction rules.

Gabe raised concerns that the proposal would close a section of the Dalton Highway corridor and could affect existing road trappers. He also asked what would happen with spur roads to private mining claims, villages, or other developments, and whether those roads would also have hunting and trapping closures. Members noted that the proposal and MOU did not clearly address how spur roads would be treated.

James asked why the closure was being proposed when the road would not be public and when ADF&G comments indicated there was no biological concern for the affected species. Ryan Scott responded that the proposal was connected to the administration's priority to move the area toward development and to create a "level playing field" so road users would not have an advantage. He also acknowledged the point that the road would already be closed and said public safety could be a concern, but specific future crossings and access points were not yet known.

Eric opposed the proposal and said it would create another closure and reduce hunting opportunity for locals and people who may access the area by air or river. He expressed frustration that the road would be built through remote country without public access, while the state was also proposing to close hunting opportunity around it.

Krystal opposed the proposal as premature and said it was "putting the cart before the horse." She noted that there is ongoing litigation and many unknowns about the road. She also raised concerns that the proposal did not match the MOU language, because the MOU referenced hunting and fishing while the Board of Game proposal addressed hunting and trapping. She also objected to a blanket closure because the area includes RS 2477 trails, navigable waters, existing trapline trails, and other permitted activities. Krystal also said the affected communities identified in the MOU should be consulted before a closure decision is made.

Lance also opposed the proposal, stating that if the road ever became publicly accessible, the AC should not support restricting future access. He also noted that even if the road remained private, resident workers might be the only people able to lawfully use nearby resources, and he questioned why the committee would restrict those people from utilizing game or trapping resources.

Gale opposed the proposal and said the AC should make a strong statement that there are broader unresolved concerns about the Ambler Road, especially fish and wildlife protections and the need to examine fish impacts in the region. Mark Richards then asked Ryan Scott whether, because the MOU mentions fisheries, ADF&G intended to submit a similar proposal to the Board of Fisheries. Ryan responded that the fisheries divisions were aware of it, but he did not know the plan.

Krystal also asked whether the Department would submit something to the Federal Subsistence Board because of potential effects on federally qualified users and federal lands. Ryan Scott responded that ADF&G had not gotten that far yet because they were outside the federal wildlife cycle but noted that federal agencies involved in subsistence had signed the MOU and that he would anticipate the federal side may address it later.

Mike's final comment was that AIDEA and developers were treating mineral development as the only important resource and not fully considering other public resources and future local/public access. He said the issue should be put to bed and that Board action was not needed.

No separate public testimony was recorded on Proposal 4. The discussion consisted of committee member comments, questions, and ADF&G staff responses. Board of Game members and members of the public were present, but no separate public testimony was offered before the Proposal 4 vote.

Federal Subsistence Board WSA 26-04 - Request for a winter moose hunt on Gates of the Arctic federal lands for Wiseman-area residents

Action: No Action

Vote: 11 support take no action, 2 oppose take no action

Vote type: Not roll call. Eric Anslinger moved to take no action on WSA 26-04. James Paine seconded. The chair asked for unanimous consent. Krystal Lapp and Gale Vick opposed taking no action because they supported the proposal. The final vote was recorded as 11 in favor of taking no action and 2 opposed.

Discussion Summary: The committee discussed WSA 26-04 after completing the Board of Game proposals. Mark explained that, after BLM conveyed lands along the Dalton/Haul Road corridor back to the State, Wiseman residents lost the federal subsistence moose hunt opportunity they had used on those lands. He summarized the request as a replacement opportunity: a winter moose hunt on Gates of the Arctic federal lands, with no expectation that it would increase harvest because the historic harvest had been minimal.

Krystal explained why she brought the proposal to the AC, noting that Regional Advisory Councils often comment on Board of Game and Board of Fisheries matters and that she wanted that relationship to be reciprocal. She also gave background on the revocation of Public Land Orders 5150 and 5180 along the Dalton Corridor and noted that Wiseman is the only village completely within that corridor. She asked that Wiseman residents on the call be given the chance to speak about their lived experience and immediate needs.

Public testimony / Wiseman resident comments: Sean Busby, a Wiseman resident, supported the proposal. He said there are only about 13 full-time residents in Wiseman, or roughly five families that would actively try to harvest a moose. He explained that the loss of the federal lands and timing of the land revocation meant residents lost the opportunity to apply for a draw hunt by the December deadline. He emphasized food security and said some residents rely heavily, or completely, on a subsistence diet.

Scott, speaking from Heidi's Zoom account, said his family has been in Wiseman since before the pipeline or Haul Road and has traditionally harvested moose in the area. He said residents had used a one-antler bull moose opportunity for decades and that the loss of that opportunity created hardship, especially because few local residents are archery hunters.

Steve also supported the proposal, saying Wiseman residents no longer have federal subsistence opportunity on the conveyed lands and are not suddenly going to become bowhunters. He said access to moose in the park would be a "game changer."

Heidi spoke in support and said she grew up in Wiseman and has always hunted in the area. She described the land change as feeling like residents were "locked down" from hunting, cutting firewood, and other essential activities. She said moose is essential to what her family eats, she is not a bowhunter, and a winter hunt would provide an option for winter meat.

Committee and agency discussion: Krystal provided additional background, explaining that conveyance and title do not happen instantly and that it may take a year or more for the State to establish regulations for the Wiseman/Coldfoot area. She said Wiseman residents' livelihood depends heavily on subsistence, that the Koyukuk River has also been affected by poor salmon returns, and that residents also faced uncertainty around firewood access. She framed WSA 26-04 as a temporary two-year measure, from 2026 through 2028, while state regulatory issues are worked out.

Eric asked whether there was already a fall moose hunt in Gates of the Arctic. Krystal and Wiseman residents were not aware of one. Brooke McDavid later checked the regulations and confirmed there was not currently a fall hunt in Gates of the Arctic. The chat also recorded Dan Valentine stating that Gates of the Arctic did not have a federal moose season.

Ryan Scott said ADF&G was looking at near-term state opportunities as well, including a possible state winter hunt, while sorting through the legal issues around conveyance versus



fully titled state lands. He said Glenn Stout was working on the issue, that the Department recognized the change “came down kind of like a hammer,” and that ADF&G was looking at using emergency order authority to provide opportunity without having to wait for the Board of Game process. He also stated that any state opportunity would be available to all Alaska residents.

Chuck raised concern about the timing of the proposed winter hunt, noting that by December 15 many bull moose may have dropped their antlers. He questioned whether hunters would be able to reliably distinguish antlered bulls from cows if antlers had already dropped. Scott later responded from the Wiseman perspective that he has seen moose carry antlers well into winter and that if a bull has dropped its antlers, it would not be harvested under an antlered-bull requirement.

Lance said he was against the proposal. He compared the timing hardship to what Yukon Flats hunters experienced when they had to change hunting camps and find new places to hunt, saying that while the timing was difficult, it was still the regulations.

Brooke McDavid, Eastern Interior RAC Coordinator with OSM, explained that the Federal Subsistence Board would take up WSA 26-04 at its summer work session on August 4–5. She said the analysis should be posted online a couple of weeks before the meeting, and if approved, the decision would likely go into effect within 10 days unless there was an objection from above. The chat also provided the comment email address, subsistence@ios.doi.gov

Dave reminded the committee that the five-mile Dalton Highway corridor prohibition on firearm use is statutory, meaning Wiseman residents would still have to go outside that five-mile corridor unless the Legislature changed the statute.

Gabe supported the concept of the hunt, noting that the area appeared to have no current open moose season and that the moose population on Park Service land was not otherwise available to Fairbanks-area hunters. He said that if Wiseman residents could use that currently unhunted population without competing with other hunters on state land, he did not see a reason to oppose it. He also said he has seen bulls carry antlers into February.

Mike said he did not oppose Wiseman residents being able to hunt in Gates of the Arctic, but believed Fairbanks AC constituents could not participate in that hunt and were not directly affected. He recommended that the AC leave the argument to local residents and the local AC, while possibly commenting that the Fairbanks AC understood the issue and supported the concept of replacing the lost subsistence opportunity. He also referenced the area biologist’s view that the proposed additional harvest would not have a biological impact.

Gale supported WSA 26-04, saying she viewed the AC as a “friend of the court” and that Wiseman was in a difficult transitional period. Krystal also supported the proposal, urging the AC to think of Wiseman residents as neighbors and noting that ACs are often asked for comments in federal subsistence processes. She argued that the situation was about people’s

food and immediate needs, and that what happens in Wiseman could set a precedent for other communities.

Eric ultimately moved to take no action, explaining that hunting in Gates of the Arctic was outside the Fairbanks AC's ability to participate and did not affect Fairbanks AC constituents in the same way BLM or Forest Service lands might. After the motion passed 10–2, members discussed submitting comments or minutes explaining that the AC was sympathetic to Wiseman residents and that some members supported the proposal, even though the committee took no formal action.

VIII. Other Business: Fisheries Update and Other Business

Gale reported that Board of Fisheries agenda change requests (ACRs) are due August 29, 2026, and that the Board of Fish work session is scheduled for October 28-29, 2026. Work session comments are due October 13, 2026; a fisheries subcommittee meeting was discussed for October 12, 2026. She also summarized concerns related to Area M, including the dismissed lawsuit, the Attorney General action vacating several Board of Fish actions from the February meeting, reversion to the 2023 Adaptive Management Plan, and reported June fishery harvest numbers of approximately 415,000 chum salmon and nearly 1,000 Chinook salmon at the time of the meeting.

The AC discussed moving the already-noticed August 10, 2026, full AC meeting to July 21, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. by Zoom to discuss fisheries ACRs before the deadline.

Virgil discussed mandatory retention, Chinook reporting concerns, and enforcement/citation concerns in the South Peninsula fishery.

Deena reminded members that Yukon River closures for Chinook and summer chum salmon were being announced by district as the Chinook run moved upriver; four-inch mesh opportunities and later gillnet removal dates would be announced by emergency order. She noted Pilot Station Chinook counts were higher than recent years but still well below average and unlikely to meet escapement goals.

Gabe asked that the AC consider a future agenda item on cost-saving measures for locking tags, including whether the state could move away from plastic locking tags toward adhesive tags to reduce mailing and tag costs.

Leila noted that members interested in Copper River reports could email her to be added to the distribution list.

Next Meeting: July 21, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. by Zoom only, to discuss Board of Fisheries ACRs and related fisheries business.

Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:22 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Minutes Recorded By: Krystal Lapp

Minutes Approved By: Levi Lewellyn & Mark RichardsDate: July 7, 2026

Alaska Board of Game Special Session July 22nd and 23rd, 2026 Fairbanks, AK Comment Deadline July 16, 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
1	Reauthorize a non-intensive management predator control plan for muskox in Unit 26B, as follows		
SUPPORT	12	0	The AC supported past efforts to curb muskox predation that were successful in helping muskox recovery and we fully support renewed efforts to ensure muskox on the north slope rebound fully.
2	Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only, as follows		
SUPPORT	13	0	These type of devices are currently used legally in other states and provide no advantage to the hunter. They are needed for hunters with poor near-vision to better see pin sights and the AC fully supports their use for archery.
3	Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only, as follows		
SUPPORT	12	1	These type of devices are currently used legally in other states and provide no advantage to the hunter. They are needed for hunters with poor near-vision to better see pin sights and the AC fully supports their use for archery. One member voted no due to opinion that the electronic scope aspect of the proposal went too far.
4	Close a 2-mile-wide corridor along the Ambler Road – as follows		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC voted unanimously in opposition to Proposal 4 and recommended the board take no action. See our comments on Proposal #4 in separate letter See our comments on Proposal #4 in separate letter

Federal Subsistence Board - Wildlife Special Action WSA 26-04



Proposal	Description	Action / Vote	Comments, Discussion, Voting Notes
WSA 26-04	Request to establish a temporary federal winter moose hunt in Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve for federally qualified subsistence users affected by the loss of prior federal subsistence opportunity along the Dalton corridor near Wiseman.	NO ACTION 10 support for no action, 2 oppose	The AC heard comments from Wiseman residents describing loss of prior federal subsistence opportunity after the Dalton corridor lands were transferred to state management, the importance of moose for food security, and the difficulty of converting to archery-only opportunity. Discussion included whether a fall federal hunt currently exists in Gates of the Arctic (none was identified), the proposed winter timing, bull antler retention, the five-mile firearms corridor statute, expected minimal biological impact, and whether the issue directly affects the Fairbanks AC constituency. Members stated sympathy and support for the Wiseman residents, but the AC voted to take no action because the hunt would not be available to the Fairbanks AC constituency. The AC discussed submitting comments or minutes to the FSB noting the discussion and the concern for Wiseman residents.



**Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of Tuesday, July 7, 2026
Zoom Only**

I. Call to Order: 7:01pm, by Herb Mansavage, Chair

II. Roll Call

First Name	Last Name	Profile
Herb	Mansavage	Chair X
Dan	Montgomery	Vice Chair Game X
Michelle	Heun	Secretary X
Andy	Couch	Vice Chair Fish X
Neil	DeWitt	A/E
Dom	Nickles	A/E
Hunter	Hongslo	X
Birch	Yuknis	A/E (Prepared written comments)
Shawna	Williams	X
Robert (Bob)	Cassell	X
Daniel	Schmitz	X
Bruce	Privett	A/E
Steve	Bartelli	X
Dewey	Bitler	X
Pete	Imhof	X
Danny	Lewis	Alternate A/E
Ron	Linder	Alternate X

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8 members

*Present: **12**

*Members Absent (Excused): **A/E - 5**

*Members Absent (Unexcused): **A/UE - 0**

List of User Groups Present: Hunting guide, sport hunter, subsistence hunter, fishing guide, commercial fishing, sport fishing, subsistence fishing, trapping, wildlife photographer, wildlife viewing, conservationist

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

Ryan Scott, Division Director, AK Fish and Game Wildlife Conversation Headquarters



Ross Dorendorf, Wildlife Biologist 3 (Palmer)
Tim Peltier, Fish and Game Coordinator (Palmer)
Leila Williams, Board Support

IV. Guests Present:

Rod Arno, Alaska Outdoor Council (AOC)
Mark Richards, Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)
Mike Harris, Alaskan Bowhunters Association (ABA)
Carri Ann Mueller, Alaska Board of Game (BOG) member
David Lorrington, AK BOG member
Lancee Whitman

V. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve made by Michelle, second by Steve

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (None)

VII. Reports

a. Chair's report

Chair Mansavage asked members how they would like to proceed with meeting. He suggested not taking up Proposal 1 as it is outside the Mat Su Advisory Committee area.

b. ADF&G

Director Scott explained proposals 2 and 3 are priorities for this administration. The special meeting was primarily for Proposal 4. Proposal 1 was submitted mainly to expedite signing. Proposal 2 is for non-electronic sites and Proposal 3 is electronic. These would provide for hunters who need sight assistance and it's fair to say it would likely provide opportunity.

c. Others

VIII. Public Comment

Mark Richards, RHAK: Opposed to Proposal 4. Too far reaching, too soon.

Rod Arno, AOC: Opposed to Proposal. Want to hear the departments justification to have these proposals in the summer.

Mike Harris, Alaskan Bowhunters Association: On Proposals 2-3. Proposal 3 adds language in for electronic sites and could open the door for more verifiers. In their board discussion there are some against everything in the proposals and some are neutral. Opposed to Proposal 3. Main concern is why are these in a special meeting and department initiated. Very concerned the precedent this may set throwing these into a special meeting. We would rather see No Action. Should be a public proposal. Believe it's a misuse of a special meeting. Would like to see No Action on both.

Director Scott: Proposal 4 refer to the Memo of Understanding (MOU). I believe this is the first



step to out things in place to move the Ambler Road forward. We are a development state and the administration is interested in mining development. (MOU provided to committee members by Chair Mansavage.)

IX. Old Business None

X. New Business

a) Board of Game Special Session Proposals 1-4

b) Other Fish & Game Business as Needed

Alaska Board of Game Special Session			
July 22 -23, 2026 Fairbanks, AK Comment Deadline 8:00am, July 16, 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
1	Reauthorize a non-intensive management predator control plan for muskox in Unit 26B, as follows		
No Action			Committee agreed to take No Action as this is out of the district and no one had strong background knowledge on it.
2	Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only, as follows		
Oppose	0	13	Herb: Take up 2 and 3 together? Michelle: Requested clarification on the difference between the two proposals. Andy: Motion to adopt /second. (See comments in Proposal 3.) Hunter: Call question. Herb: Anyone in support?
3	Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only, as follows		
Oppose	0	13	Andy: Agreed the proposals looked nearly identical and I would like to understand the distinction before deciding. Hearing from the public and the department, this came from the administration. I see no need to support either of these away from the public process. Something got voted in without a public process. I will vote in opposition to both. Bob: Agree with Andy.



Alaska Board of Game Special Session

July 22 -23, 2026 | Fairbanks, AK | Comment Deadline 8:00am, July 16, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			Steve: More of point of order. Should have more public process in a normal cycle. I don't think this is appropriate.
4	Establish a 2-mile hunting and trapping closure corridor on either side of the proposed Ambler Access Road through Units 22, 23, and 24A		
Oppose	1	11	Motion made by Andy to adopt, Steve second. Andy: What does department have to say? What is the reason? Herb: Looking at the map for the access project the MOU. Department (Director Scott): We only have a proposed corridor and proposed path until things are actually constructed. There is a lot of state land. There are other things here that don't involve wildlife. Alaska Industrial Development Authority (AIDEA) will be at both days meetings to answer questions. Steve: When it's hunting season every conveyance for construction and mining use has a rifle in it. If this is going to be a private road these folks will have their own private land to hunt which is not open to the public which paid for its construction. I know 422 square miles closed to hunting, but if none of the rest of us have access is it right to let workers have their own private hunting grounds? Is there conservation concern for that game area? Director Scott: Not right now because there is not access. Will there be in the future, possibly. This closure is applicable to everyone. Steve: Only people allowed on the road. It will be private. Dewey: One chance to get it right before the project goes in. Planning ahead. The haul road works out good with the five-mile buffer. Just because there is a gate on one side doesn't mean an airplane can't land. I'm all for a two-mile buffer. If you put a road in and allow them to hunt it doesn't help the villages. Dan: I'm opposed to the whole thing. The locals travel all over up there and they need to be able to cross the road with no restrictions. I opposed the whole project. I don't think the public should be paying for any of it. Mr. Lorrington to Director Scott: Does the MOU stop the federal subsistence from allowing the same thing to happen to be able to hunt within the corridor. BLM is one of the signatories and that intent is to do that. Bob: This is public property and using public funds to do this. State money to close roads to hunting access. I oppose this strongly.



Alaska Board of Game Special Session

July 22 -23, 2026 | Fairbanks, AK | Comment Deadline 8:00am, July 16, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			Mr. Richards: Companies don't allow any of the drivers, workers, or pilots to hunt. Herb: Was the five-mile corridor on the Dalton was that for the safety of the pipeline or hunting concerns? Director Scott: Overlying regulations, it's complicated. Lots of overlying statutes that govern that. Herb: Was the five-mile a F&G proposal or DOT official position? Director Scott: I believe it was BOG proposal. I don't know the distance. Dewey made a good point, I think a lot of people opposed to the Ambler, I see them use the Dalton. It's an access and echoes Dan and Bob. This just seems like too much of an overreach. No hunting or trapping is very restrictive. Director Scott: Some of these questions should be directed to AIDEA. Bring in the history of the Dalton Hwy as it is the closest to this. Bob to Director Scott: The Governor has directed the department to bring this to the Board. The one-mile closure is political also being directed by the Governor and the village corporations to protect the resource, but will have access. Director Scott: I don't know the answer to that. That's outside hunting and trapping and should be directed to AIDEA. The Ambler Mine District is an administrative priority. I don't know whose driving it. Outside the hunting and trapping aspects. Andy: Been losing moose to road traffic and in the Mat Su valley it has opened up opportunities. There will be hot spots where animals will get hit, so maybe providing opportunities to hunt. I don't know if villages would be able to get there anyway. Hunter: I will be opposed to the two-mile closure. Right now, you can go and hunt there. Public land and public pays. Another loss of hunting land. Dewey: This is like the difference between the Denali Hwy hunting close to the road. If you have access, you just can't drive to the Ambler and once a road is in now is the time to plan to do it right. A nicer experience and people won't be shooting close to the road. Steve: I am going to oppose this. I was hoping to get some comments for the BOG to reflect on. Ready to call the question. Pete: We have a guard sitting at both ends and locked out. It will mostly effect guys with planes. Even with the corridor, most of us can't touch it



Alaska Board of Game Special Session

July 22 -23, 2026 | Fairbanks, AK | Comment Deadline 8:00am, July 16, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			unless the road is open. It's a low density. If the road was opened it should be a permit system and not open it up to motorhomes. Mr. Richards: The Fairbanks AC didn't realize it, but Director Scott is right. There will be a lot of issues that come up. In Proposal 4, those proposals have to come in cycle. The Board will be inundated with agenda change requests (ACRs) allowing proposals to come in for Units 23/24A out of cycle. Herb: I'm opposed by principle. We can have discussions about buffer and closures. It should be a public process. How many people could make it to this meeting in Fairbanks in the middle of the summer? The Board needs to considering what these political motives are behind the special session. Herb: Read member Birch Yuknis written statement to be included into the record: "First, why is there a special meeting? Two, none of these would qualify for a ACR if there was a regular meeting. Third, it is not the departments place to be forwarding these proposals. And, I know they have said the road is to be private, but I will fight every day to make it a public road if one dollar of public money is spent to build the road (some already has been spent). Finally, the department should not be limiting Alaskans access to their public lands." (Ron Linder left meeting and did not vote.) Steve: Call the question. *Notes from AI transcript: The special summer session was called with limited public notice, restricting broader public participation — particularly for residents who cannot travel to Fairbanks in late July. The Ambler Road corridor closure (Proposal 4) raises unresolved questions about subsistence village access, worker hunting enforcement, and future management flexibility that fall outside Fish and Game's jurisdiction and require ADA involvement. Proposal 4 as written restricts future proposals regarding the corridor to the regular cycle, potentially creating a backlog of agenda change requests once the road is built and new issues emerge.

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting



Herb is willing to go to the meeting in Fairbanks on July 22-23, at his own expense and not use AC funds.

Andy: If there are special board meetings to have the AC participate there should be funds available. The public should not be taken out of this process.

Mr. Richards advised that ACs can call in to testify.

Leila: Specifically for the BOG to testify it has to be arranged in advance.

Andy: Made a motion that Herb represents the AC at the meeting, second and Unanimous consent.

XII. Set next meeting date (TBD)

XIII. Other

Andy: Noted that changes to the drift gill net plan for Upper Cook Inlet passed at the March statewide finfish meeting have not been reviewed by the state's legal department or signed by the Lieutenant Governor. As a result, the drift fishery is operating under previous regulations. Expressed concern that coho salmon goals at Little Susitna and Deshka River may not be met this season.

Mr. Lorrington: Asked whether Board of Game regulations from Southeast and Kodiak are in the same situation.

Alaska Board (Leila): Confirmed uncertainty about the status of those regulations and noted pauses with Area M regulations. Agreed to follow up with Carri Ann.

Ms. Mueller: Confirmed that Board of Game regulations for areas 26 and 27 are also not in effect, as the Department of Law has not approved and authorized the changes. Previous regulations remain in effect.

Danny: Noted a specific sport fishing regulation (requiring king salmon, lingcod, and halibut to be brought to dock whole) was printed in regulation books but later listed on emergency orders as not in effect.

Andy/Steve: Motion and second for written AC position on Proposal 4. If the regulation goes into effect there should be an ARC to address conservation concerns.

Herb: If these have been ACRs these would not have been a special session.

Steve: We list this as one of the many reasons why we don't support. I would make an amendment that we send the letter with bullet points.

Steve will write a letter, short with bullet points why the Mat Su Valley AC doesn't support. The letter should reflect our majority vote position.

XIV. Adjournment: 8:32pm

Minutes Recorded By: Michelle Heun, Secretary
Minutes Approved By: Herb Mansavage, Chair
Date: July 12, 2026

***The following comment was submitted by multiple individuals using identical or substantially identical text. To avoid duplication in the meeting record, staff combined these submissions into a single public comment. All individuals who submitted this comment and their stated community of residence is listed below the comment text.*



PC1

Name: Multiple Submitters, listed after comment text

Community of Residence: Multiple

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Submitted by:

Clay Alexander, Jackson, Mississippi
Alex Ames, Kenai
Thomas Arnott, Ohio
Andrew Benes, Wisconsin
Gary Bird, North Carolina
Ken Borst, Michigan
Rocky Bowker, Hickman County, Tennessee
Gary Brenner, Hillpoint, Wisconsin
Mike Broadwell, Washington State
Edward Burdick, West Grove
Rob Burnham, Virginia
Sean Card, Indiana
Chris Clum, Colorado
Alvin Coblenz, Iowa
Dan Cogswell, Anchorage
Chris Cosentino, Non resident GMU 17 hunter
Earl Cowher, New Castle, Pennsylvania
Joseph Denham, Illinois
Michael T Denham, Marseilles, Illinois
John Dietz, Washington, USA
Dan Dockery, Arkansas
Chris Dunn, USA
Shawn Eckenrode, Beaver Dam, Wisconsin
Rich Evans, Las Vegas, Nevada
Joe Flikkema, Lakewood, New York

Jerry Fowler, Junction City, Kentucky
Brian Frisk, New Boston, Michigan
Robert Fritchey, Pennsylvania
Michael Gard, Highland, Indiana
Joseph R Garris Sr, New Jersey
Tim Godwin, Arizona
Roy Grace, Arizona
Ralph Grieneringer, Idaho
Christopher Guadiz, Mililani, Hawaii
Donald Hansen, Illinois
Benjamin Hauser, Rhinelander, Wisconsin
Daniel Heitstuman, Idaho
Michael Herschbach, Highland, Illinois
Michael Horstman, San Antonio, Texas
Bryan Hum, Ohio
Brad Jansen, Germantown
Wade Job, South Carolina
Joshua Jonas, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania
Claude Josey, North Carolina
Jason Kent, New Mexico
Garrett King, International Falls, Minnesota
Bill Kissner, Illinois
James Knightly, Standish, Maine
Dave Kraemer, Braham, Minnesota
Duane Kramer, Washington
Paul Ladner, Illinois
Steve Lasley, Indiana

Kenneth Leair, Wisconsin
Brandon Learning, Michigan
Steven Lundberg, Kalispell, Montana
Joshua March, Pennsylvania
Jeremy Mason, West Virginia
Daniel Mathis, Montana
William McCullough, Ohio
Dennis Michael, Lewiston, Idaho
Jamie Miller, Licking
Gary Miller, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
carl mozeleski, Scott Twp, Pennsylvania
Bill Nash, Non-resident
Daniel Nedu, Milwaukie, Oregon
Nathan Noecker II, Pennsylvania
Greg Omer, Missouri
Dan Orro, Wisconsin
Josh Ouellette, Virginia
Jimmy Padgett, New Albany, Indiana
Jedediah Painter, Sterling
Robert Parrott, Knoxville, Tennessee
Dustin Peterson, United States of America
Jason Rife, Wisconsin
Cody Robling, Indiana
Ethan Rodrigue, Tennessee

Charles Russell, Sunbury, Ohio
Charles Russell, Sunbury, Ohio
William Santore, Chardon, Ohio
Thomas Schmiedlin, Leechburg,
Pennsylvania
Jakc Shambo, Pe Ell, Washington
Chris Smith, Monrovia
Gene Smith, Sterling, Alaska
Forest Spradlin, Fishers, indiana
Matt Steed, Mississippi
James Stewart, Columbia, South Carolina
Thomas C Szeszko, Pennsylvania
Brent Taft, New Mexico
Ian Thomas, Fairbanks
Coby Thomas, Fairbanks
Donald Thompson, Missouri
Dick Titterington, Mallard Pointe
Bob Toler, Birmingham, Alabama
Wes Wainscott, Oklahoma
Joel Weaver, Lewisburg, Kentucky
Manuel Weiss, Crawfordville, Florida
Todd Woods, Bedford, Indiana
Thomas Yadlosky, Pennsylvania

Name: Nick Adler

Community of Residence: Kotzebue

Comment:

NO AMBLER ROAD!



PC2

**PC3**

Name: James Akenson

Community of Residence: Enterprise, Oregon

Comment:

I have bowhunted Alaska's wild places for over 40 years - with a recurve bow and homemade arrows. It is outrageous to think that technology is creeping into this great state's hunting heritage. I have nothing against firearm hunting for those that prefer that method with its efficiency, but bowhunting should be kept as challenging as possible.

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. I also encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

**PC4**

Name: Alaska Outdoor Council

Community of Residence: Palmer

Comment:

Proposal 1. Oppose adoption.

Musk Oxen recovery plan reauthorization for GMU 26B

The Alaska Outdoor Council (AOC) opposed the original Musk ox recovery plan (Plan) back in March 2012. The BOG action to create a "non-intensive" lethal predator/prey research management scheme is contrary to the intent of the Intensive Management Law, (IM) AS 16.05.255(e)(1)-(3) which lays out in detail that any legitimate IM plan adopted by the BOG has to benefit more than just local subsistence amounts necessary (ANS). Fish and Game Funds AS 16.05.100, and PR Federal Restoration Funds (PR) are supposed to be used for maximum benefit. The BOG may reduce brown bears in GMU26(B) under other sections of AS 16.05.255 other than under Section (e). the Intensive Management law.

Proposal 4. Oppose.

Build the regulations in 5 AAC 92.510 and 5 AAC 92.550 to close hunting and trapping along a road corridor on state land before the route is finalized is unacceptable to the Alaska Outdoor Council (AOC).

Once the Ambler Road MOU is amended to allow Public Use AOC will participate in the Board process to assure continued conservation of game as needed.



Alaskan Bowhunters Association

Comments on Proposals 2, 3 & 4 – Alaska Board of Game Special Meeting

On behalf of the Alaskan Bowhunters Association (ABA), we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on Proposals 2, 3 and 4 before the Alaska Board of Game. The ABA is dedicated to preserving and promoting Alaska's bowhunting heritage while supporting the Board's constitutional mandate for sustained yield and science-based wildlife management. We also believe the Board's established regulatory process is fundamental to ensuring transparency, meaningful public participation, and public confidence in wildlife management decisions.

The Alaskan Bowhunters Association respectfully requests that the Board of Game take no action on either Proposal 2 or Proposal 3.

Our primary concern is not simply the substance of these proposals, but the process by which they have been brought before the Board.

The Board of Game's regulatory cycle exists to ensure transparency, meaningful public participation, and thoughtful deliberation. Special meetings have historically been reserved for issues that cannot reasonably wait until the next regular meeting. Proposals 2 and 3 do not meet that standard. They involve broad policy decisions regarding legal bowhunting equipment and should be considered, if at all, through the established public proposal process during the normal statewide regulatory cycle.

The ABA is also concerned that these proposals originated from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department serves an essential role in advising the Board on biological, conservation, and wildlife management matters and, when necessary, may appropriately submit proposals to address biological, conservation, or wildlife management concerns, statutory requirements, or other issues requiring timely Board action.

The ABA recognizes that equipment regulations can, in certain circumstances, be an appropriate subject for Department proposals. For example, if modifications to legal hunting equipment were necessary to address a demonstrated biological or conservation concern, or to achieve a specific wildlife management objective, Department involvement would be both appropriate and expected.

However, that is not the case here. Proposals 2 and 3 do not identify or attempt to address a demonstrated biological, conservation, or wildlife management need. Instead, they seek to make broad policy changes regarding legal bowhunting equipment. Proposals of this nature fall outside the Department's normal role and should not originate from the Department—particularly through an out-of-cycle special meeting. Questions involving broad equipment policy should instead be brought forward through the established public proposal process, where Advisory Committees, stakeholder organizations, and individual hunters have a full and fair opportunity to review, discuss, and provide meaningful input before the Board considers regulatory changes.

Regarding Proposal 2, the ABA does not necessarily oppose every concept contained within the proposal. However, the proposal contains language that raises legitimate concerns and deserves substantially more public discussion than is possible through this special meeting process. Equipment policy of this significance should receive full public review through the normal Board of Game cycle before any action is considered.

Regarding Proposal 3, the ABA opposes the proposal. Proposal 3 would authorize electronic sighting systems for use during Alaska's archery-only hunts, representing a significant departure from the current equipment standards that have long governed these opportunities.

Existing technology already demonstrates the significance of this proposal. Products such as the Garmin Xero rangefinding bow sight incorporate an electronic laser rangefinder that measures the exact distance to the target and electronically displays the appropriate illuminated aiming point based on the bow's programmed ballistic profile. With conventional archery equipment, a hunter typically ranges the animal before drawing the bow. Once at full draw, if the animal changes distance, the hunter generally has two options: take the shot based on the original range or let the bow down, re-range the animal with a handheld laser rangefinder, redraw, and attempt to regain the opportunity to shoot. An electronic rangefinding sight fundamentally changes that sequence. While

remaining at full draw, the hunter can activate the integrated rangefinder, instantly receive an updated distance, and the sight automatically moves the illuminated aiming point to the correct position for that distance. If the animal continues to move, the hunter can repeat this process without ever lowering the bow. By electronically performing range determination and aiming-point selection throughout the shot sequence, these systems assume a responsibility that has historically rested with the hunter. Rather than relying on the hunter's ability to accurately judge changing conditions and manage the shot sequence, the equipment performs those functions electronically.

More importantly, Proposal 3 is not limited to currently available technology. By authorizing electronic sighting systems, the Board would establish a regulatory framework that could allow increasingly sophisticated electronic aiming systems to become legal as technology continues to advance. Proposal 3 should therefore be evaluated not only for the equipment available today, but also for the precedent it establishes for future technological developments.

The Pope and Young Club, North America's leading bowhunting conservation organization and keeper of the world's premier bowhunting records program, has concluded that electronically assisted rangefinding bow sights, including the Garmin Xero, are inconsistent with its Fair Chase equipment standards and are not eligible for entry into the Club's Records Program. This reflects the view of one of the nation's most respected bowhunting organizations that these devices represent a significant departure from current equipment standards and fair chase principles.

The authorization of electronic sighting systems is a broad equipment policy decision—not a biological, conservation, or wildlife management issue requiring Department initiation through a special meeting. Proposal 3 would fundamentally change the direction of Alaska's archery-only hunting regulations while establishing a precedent for increasingly sophisticated electronic aiming systems in the future. Such a significant departure from Alaska's current equipment standards should only be considered, if at all, through the established statewide regulatory cycle where Advisory Committees, stakeholder organizations, and the public have a full opportunity to participate.

Some proponents argue that this technology promotes more ethical hunting by enabling more precise shots. The ABA rejects that premise. Ethical bowhunting is not determined by the amount of technology attached to a bow, but by the judgment exercised by the hunter. Ethics come into play when a hunter decides whether the conditions presented justify taking the shot—not whether technology can compensate for changing distances or other variables encountered during the encounter. This is fundamentally a fair chase issue. Fair chase recognizes that wildlife should retain a reasonable opportunity to evade the hunter and that success should depend primarily upon the hunter's skill, preparation, and decision-making rather than increasingly sophisticated electronic assistance. Proposal 3 shifts that balance by transferring responsibilities that have historically rested with the hunter to the equipment itself. As technology increasingly replaces hunter judgment and execution during the shot sequence, the balance between hunter skill and technological assistance is fundamentally altered.

Another common argument in support of relaxing equipment restrictions is that doing so expands hunting opportunity. The ABA also disagrees with that assertion. The opportunity to participate in bowhunting in Alaska already exists and is equally available to every hunter. Those opportunities have always included equipment restrictions that define the unique challenge and character of bowhunting. A hunter's decision not to participate under those existing regulations does not mean the opportunity is unavailable; it simply reflects a personal choice not to accept the limitations associated with those hunts. Expanding the types of equipment that may be used does not create new opportunity—it changes the nature of the opportunity that already exists. Restricted-weapon hunts, by their very nature, are intended to limit the methods of take while providing unique hunting opportunities. Removing or relaxing those restrictions does not expand opportunity; it fundamentally alters the character of those opportunities.

Regarding Proposal 4, the ABA takes no formal position. The abbreviated public review period associated with this special meeting has not provided sufficient opportunity for the ABA to fully evaluate the proposal or develop a formal organizational position.

However, should the Board determine that additional restrictions are appropriate within the proposed Ambler Road corridor, the ABA encourages consideration of a more narrowly tailored approach than a complete hunting closure. The Board has previously addressed similar roadside hunting concerns through the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area by allowing bow and arrow only while restricting more effective methods of take. A comparable approach could be considered for the Ambler Road corridor. Restricting the corridor to bow and arrow only would continue to provide meaningful public hunting opportunity while substantially reducing hunter success and harvest potential compared to unrestricted hunting.

Regardless of the alternative ultimately selected, the ABA believes Proposal 4 would likewise benefit from full consideration through the normal regulatory cycle, where Advisory Committees, stakeholder organizations, and all affected user groups have an adequate opportunity to review the proposal, provide meaningful input, and participate in the discussion before the Board considers permanent regulatory changes.

Finally, the ABA respectfully requests that Proposals 2 and 3 not simply be postponed, tabled, or carried forward to the upcoming statewide Board of Game meeting. These are Department proposals that were not submitted through the established public proposal process. If members of the public believe these issues warrant future consideration, they should submit proposals during the next statewide call for proposals. Those proposals can then proceed through the normal regulatory cycle, allowing Advisory Committees, stakeholder organizations, and the public the same opportunity for review and participation afforded to every other proposal before the Board.

The integrity of Alaska's regulatory process is just as important as the outcome of any individual proposal. Regardless of one's views on the underlying equipment issues, these proposals should not be considered outside the established process that has long ensured transparency, fairness, and meaningful public involvement in Board of Game decisions.

For these reasons, the Alaskan Bowhunters Association respectfully requests that the Board of Game take no action on Proposals 2 and 3. Regarding Proposal 4, the ABA takes no formal position due to the abbreviated public review period associated with this special meeting but respectfully encourages the Board to consider a more narrowly tailored alternative, such as an archery-only corridor, if the Board determines that additional restrictions are warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Harris Vice President Alaskan Bowhunters Association



**AMBLER
METALS**

July 15, 2026

Ambler Metals LLC
2550 Denali Street
Unit 1605
Anchorage, AK 99503

info@amblermetals.com
www.amblermetals.com

Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Re: Public Comments in Support of Proposed Amendments to 5 AAC 92.510 and
5 AAC 92.550 Regarding Hunting and Trapping in the Vicinity of the Ambler Road

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game:

Ambler Metals LLC submits these comments in support of the Board of Game's proposed regulation changes addressing the use and taking of game in Game Management Units 23, 24, and 26(B), including the proposed amendments to 5 AAC 92.510 regarding hunting in the vicinity of the proposed Ambler Road and 5 AAC 92.550 regarding trapping in the vicinity of the proposed Ambler Road. Ambler Metals supports these proposed changes because they will promote the safety of road users, hunters, trappers, nearby communities, and others who may be present in the vicinity of the proposed road corridor.

Ambler Metals is an Alaskan company, established in 2020, with offices in Anchorage and Fairbanks. Ambler Metals works in partnership with NANA Regional Corporation for the exploration and development of the Upper Kobuk Mineral Projects and is focused on advancing two projects in the Ambler Mining District: Arctic and Bornite.

Ambler Metals' work in the Ambler Mining District depends on safe, responsible access and careful coordination with local communities, Alaska Native partners, landowners, agencies, and other stakeholders in the region. Ambler Metals maintains an active partnership with NANA and meets regularly with NANA representatives and local tribes to share updates on project plans and developments in the area. As an Alaskan company working in a remote region of the state, our company understands that responsible development must be grounded in safety, respect, transparency, environmental stewardship, and meaningful engagement with those who live, work, hunt, trap, and travel in the region.



The Arctic project is located approximately 22 miles northeast of Kobuk, 168 miles east of Kotzebue, and 162 miles west of the Dalton Highway. The Bornite project is located approximately 13 miles by road north of Kobuk, 154 miles east of Kotzebue, and 171 miles west of the Dalton Highway. These distances underscore the remote nature of the Ambler Mining District and the importance of clear, practical rules that promote safe travel and reduce avoidable conflicts among road users, hunters, trappers, and project-related activities.

Ambler Metals supports the Board's proposed amendments to the hunting and trapping regulations in the vicinity of the Ambler Road because they are a prudent and practical measure to reduce safety risks. Roads create unique safety considerations where vehicles, workers, residents, visitors, hunters, and trappers may be present in the same corridor. Clear rules governing hunting and trapping near the road will help protect people using the road while preserving appropriate opportunities for lawful hunting and trapping in the surrounding region.

The proposed changes also support orderly and predictable management of activities near the proposed Ambler Road. Predictable rules are important for everyone who may use or encounter the road corridor, including subsistence users, recreational hunters and trappers, local residents, contractors, agency personnel, and project personnel. By clarifying the standards that apply in the vicinity of the road, the Board can help reduce confusion, promote compliance, and ensure that different users can plan their activities safely and responsibly.

Ambler Metals also supports the Board's consideration of related statewide and regional game management provisions, including the proposed amendments concerning the reauthorization of the non-intensive management predator control plan for muskoxen in Unit 26B and the use of equipment in hunts for big game with archery. Ambler Metals defers to the Board, the Department of Fish and Game, affected communities, and wildlife management professionals on the technical details of those proposals. Ambler Metals' principal interest in these comments is to express support for the proposed hunting and trapping provisions relating to the proposed Ambler Road and for the Board's broader effort to promote safe, responsible, and well-managed use of wildlife resources.

Ambler Metals recognizes the importance of hunting, trapping, subsistence practices, and traditional uses of the land and wildlife in Northwest Alaska. Ambler Metals' support for the proposed amendments is not intended to diminish those important activities. Rather, Ambler Metals supports reasonable, targeted measures that improve safety in the



~ 3 ~

immediate vicinity of the road while allowing continued lawful use of surrounding lands and resources consistent with applicable law and sound wildlife management.

For these reasons, Ambler Metals respectfully supports adoption of the proposed amendments to 5 AAC 92.510 and 5 AAC 92.550 concerning hunting and trapping in the vicinity of the proposed Ambler Road corridor. Ambler Metals appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments and thanks the Board of Game, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Boards Support Section for their work on these proposed regulations.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "CS" or similar initials.

Cole Schaeffer, VP Human Resources, Communities & Partnerships
Ambler Metals LLC
2550 Denali Street, Unit 1605
Anchorage, Alaska 99503



July 9, 2026

Re. Comments on Proposal 4 for the Board of Game Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road – July 22-23, 2026

Dear Chair and Members of the Alaska Board of Game

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on Proposal 4 for the Jul 22-23, 2026 Special Meeting regarding Muskox, Archery, and the Ambler Road. The Wildlife Conservation Society respectfully opposes Proposal 4 and recommends that the Board reject or defer the proposal until ADF&G provides a more complete and science-based assessment of the wildlife, subsistence, enforcement, and access-management issues associated with the proposed Ambler Road corridor. In reviewing Proposal 4, WCS is concerned that the proposal as written does not provide the level of analysis needed to support a defensible wildlife-management response to a major new access corridor. We raise the following concerns:

The proposal does not clearly identify a problem it intends to solve. The issue statement describes the proposed Ambler Road and the associated proposed closure, but it does not articulate a specific problem that the closure would address.

The proposed 2-mile buffer is not clearly justified by science. The department does not provide information or analysis on why a 2-mile buffer (i.e., 1-mile from the road surface in either direction) was selected. For example, is it for the safety of road users from weapons use or is it to manage impacts on wildlife? With respect to the latter, the proposed Ambler Road runs through a currently remote landscape, and its effects on both hunter/trapper access (e.g., on harvest distribution) and local ecology (e.g., wildlife movements) will extend beyond the 2-mile buffer. Any regulations that seek to support wildlife management objectives should be science-based and consider likely access, travel methods, terrain, spur road development, human behavior, and species-specific vulnerabilities.

The proposal's rationale is internally inconsistent. It concludes that the road presents “no biological concern” which is at odds with the vast literature⁵ on road ecology and much of the recent scholarship on this subject in Alaska⁴. The Department also acknowledges that some moose and caribou populations within the affected management units are already subject to intensive management findings (with the justification from ADF&G that these populations are currently at risk^{1,2}), and baseline population or harvest data are lacking for black bears, most furbearers, small game, and waterfowl. Much of this lack of information was also acknowledged in the Ambler Road NEPA documents. The proposal also anticipates unresolved cumulative issues related to spur roads, navigable waters, access to mining claims,



enforcement, and the likely need for additional regulations after construction begins. These uncertainties acknowledged by the department undermine the conclusion that the road will have no biological impacts.

A narrow road closure does not address the conservation and management

concerns around expanding access of this scale. As written, the road corridor will still facilitate access beyond the closed corridor into areas that are currently difficult to reach. New access may concentrate hunting and trapping pressure near crossings, trails, pullouts, spur roads, and areas reachable by snowmachine or ATV on any new trails that parallel the road (i.e., hunters and trappers do not necessarily need to use the road for travel, but it offers an alluring safety net during winter for hunters and trappers accessing this area). Remote portions of Unit 23 and 24 currently function, in part, as de facto refugia for wide-ranging wildlife due to their limited access. The Board should not assume that the low historical harvest in this remote area is predictive of low harvest after this major transportation corridor is constructed, as implied in this proposal.

Implications to subsistence and food security require stronger analysis. The Board should consider whether new road access could reasonably affect wildlife distribution, local harvest patterns, competition for resources, enforcement needs, and nearby communities' abilities to continue customary uses⁵. A narrow corridor closure may limit some local harvest while doing little to address broader impacts related to expanding access beyond the road. ADF&G should clearly identify what users and communities may be affected and whether it will help protect subsistence opportunities over the long term. The Yukon River salmon crisis provides a cautionary example of the risks of implementing localized restrictions without a transparent assessment of whether those restrictions address the principal drivers of concern, where years of harvest restrictions within rivers have imposed major costs to subsistence communities. Meanwhile, Chinook and chum returns remain depressed due to the principal drivers of low marine survival, bycatch, climate-related ecosystem change, and cumulative stressors³. This example illustrates how local users are burdened when management decisions are not based on transparent monitoring and analysis or paired with an assessment of whether the restrictions address the actual drivers of concerns.

We at WCS respectfully recommend that the Board reject or defer Proposal 4 until ADF&G can provide a more complete, science-based access and wildlife-management plan consistent with Alaska's sustained-yield, conservation, public-process, and subsistence responsibilities, as well as ADF&G's guiding principles of maintaining the highest scientific integrity and providing long-term opportunities for people to use and enjoy Alaska's wildlife resources. At a minimum, an assessment should include:

1. A clear statement of the biological, harvest-management, subsistence, enforcement, and access issues the regulation is intended to address;
2. Justification for the proposed 2-mile buffer distance, including comparison with other management approaches for road corridors in Alaska, like the DHCMA;
3. Species-specific considerations for caribou, moose, bears, wolves, wolverines, and other furbearers, or a plan to assess these;
4. Analysis of likely access effects beyond the immediate road corridor, including crossings, waterways, spur roads, trails, and off-road travel adjacent to the road;
5. A monitoring and adaptive-management framework with defined triggers for future regulation, and transparency in reporting and enforcement capacity.



WCS opposes the Ambler Road, but if it is built, it would represent a major change in access across a remote and ecologically important region of Units 23 and 24. Regulations governing hunting and trapping in light of the new access should be based on defined management objectives, adequate baseline information, and a realistic assessment of how road access may affect wildlife and subsistence uses across the broader landscape, rather than solely through an arbitrarily defined corridor. Furthermore, the areas' role as refugia for some species of wildlife should be considered, as impacts associated with the road corridor could impact much broader areas than the road corridor alone^{7,8}. The consideration of a buffer should fully address these concerns and be based on science.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kayla SL".

Kayla Shively, MSc
Conservation Ecologist, Arctic Beringia Program
Wildlife Conservation Society

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Martin Robards".

Dr. Martin Robards
Regional Director, Arctic Beringia Program
Wildlife Conservation Society



References

1. Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2014. *Unit 24 moose: Moose management report of survey-inventory activities, 1 July 2011–30 June 2013* (Chapter 33; ADF&G/DWC/SMR-2014-6).
2. Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). 2025. *Unit 23 moose management report and plan, 1 July 2015–30 June 2025*. Division of Wildlife Conservation, Species Management Report and Plan.
3. Cunningham, C.J., Westley, P.A.H., and Adkison, M.D. 2018. “Signals of Large Scale Climate Drivers, Hatchery Enhancement, and Marine Factors in Yukon River Chinook Salmon Survival Revealed with a Bayesian Life History Model.” *Global Change Biology* 24:4399-4416.
4. Fullman, T.J. et al. 2025. “Behavioral Responses of Migratory Caribou to Semi-Permeable Roads.” *Scientific Reports*.
5. Guettabi, M., Greenberg, J., Little, J., & Joly, K. (2016). Evaluating potential economic effects of an industrial road on subsistence in north-central Alaska. *Arctic*, 305-317.
6. Haddad, N. M. et al. 2015. “Habitat Fragmentation and Its Lasting Impact on Earth’s Ecosystems.” *Science Advances* 1: e1500052.
7. Kukka, P. M., Jung, T. S., & Schmiegelow, F. K. (2022). Spatiotemporal patterns of wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) harvest: the potential role of refugia in a quota-free system. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 68(2), 16.
8. Scrafford, M. A., Copeland, J., McCaw, L. K., Sawaya, M. A., & Boyce, M. (2025). Wolverines and wilderness: A review of wolverine response to human disturbance. *Environmental Reviews*, 33, 1-15.

**PC8****Name:** Kevin Bahr**Community of Residence:** Morton, Illinois**Comment:**

Aside from the fact that the ADF&G is promoting this on their own, these items are just making it easier to kill animals in what is supposed to be a primitive weapons season/area. I'm suspicious of the timing of this proposal as it apparently didn't come from public meetings with concerned user groups, namely the Alaska Bowhunters Association.

I OPPOSE the passage of this bill.

**PC9****Name:** Mike Barrett**Community of Residence:** Dayton, Wyoming**Comment:**

I am shocked by Ak G&F support of proposal 2. There is such an uproar about technology and hunting anymore not being fair chase it isn't funny. Lazy people are continually looking for another "edge" to increase their effective range (longer range=lazier people). Absolutely kill #2. Mike Barrett, Dayton Wy.

**PC10****Name:** Douglas Borland**Community of Residence:** Sitka**Comment:**

As a life member, an original founder, and a past officer of the Alaska Bowhunters Association, and as a resident Alaskan for over 50 years, I adamantly oppose proposals #2 and #3.

The fundamental principle of bowhunting as “hunting the hard way” has already been altered by the over-mechanization of bowhunting equipment; represented as improvements and aids, but instead that are in reality substitutes for the skills and woodsmanship that true bowhunting requires.

Such so-called mechanical and electrical aids to equipment in truth only increase wounding losses by promoting the false premise that they increase the effective range and accuracy of the bow-and-arrow. This negatively impacts not only the image of traditional archery hunting, where the process is, or should be, more important than the kill, but also provides ammunition for the anti-hunting faction to oppose all hunting.

Please recognize the opinion of concerned Bowhunters like myself who have been supporters of fair-chase and care about the future of hunting and bowhunting in Alaska.

Thank you for your consideration, Doug Borland, Sitka



PC11

Name: Bob Bosman

Community of Residence: Naubinway, Michigan

Comment:

Take no action on proposals 2 and 3



PC12

Name: Terry Bowling

Community of Residence: Indiana

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.



PC13

Name: Cody Brandes

Community of Residence: Iowa

Comment:

I oppose expanding hunting optics with the new technologies outlined in this proposal. It is foundational to the sport of bow hunting that a hunter develop proficient through knowledge, practice, and hard work. Through this exercise, hunters develop respect for the land and quarry they seek.

**PC14**

Name: Bryan Burkhardt

Community of Residence: Michigan

Comment:

- I urge the Board of Game to TAKE NO ACTION on Proposals 2 & 3.
- I ask the Board to require that significant changes to Alaska's bowhunting regulations be submitted by members of the public through the established public proposal process during the normal regulatory cycle.
- Special meetings should be reserved for issues that genuinely cannot wait until the regular proposal cycle.
- I support a transparent regulatory process that provides meaningful public participation and adequate time for review.
- I'm concerned that continually expanding allowable archery technology may ultimately reduce future bowhunting opportunities.
- Proposal 3 would legalize additional electronic sighting technology, including electronic rangefinding bow sights that are not recognized by the Pope and Young Club for entry into its Records Program.
- I encourage the Board to preserve the unique character and long-term future of Alaska's archery-only hunting opportunities.

Bryan Burkhardt

Lifetime Member - Alaskan Bowhunters Association

**PC15**

Name: Cody Butkiewicz

Community of Residence: North Pole

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the scope of the hunting and trapping closure proposed in Proposal 4 for the Ambler Mining District access road.

The proposal would close a 1-mile-wide corridor on each side of the entire 211-mile road to hunting and trapping. While I understand the department's stated rationale — safety along a private, gated, 24/7 industrial haul route — a closure of this scale, applied to the road's full length, is a significant restriction on public hunting and trapping opportunity in Units 23 and 24, areas that include important caribou migration routes and subsistence and sport harvest grounds.

Alaska's Constitution, Article VIII, Section 3 (Common Use), reserves fish and wildlife, wherever occurring in their natural state, to the people for common use. Alaska courts have held that resource regulations must have adequate justification and a reasonable basis for the distinctions they draw among users. A 2-mile-wide, 211-mile-long closure — even one that preserves crossing rights — functions as a de facto exclusive-use zone for the mining operator along a substantial stretch of public land. I don't believe the department has demonstrated that a corridor of this width, for this entire length, is necessary to meet the stated safety objective.



PC16

Name: Jack Caddell

Community of Residence: Rockwall, Texas

Comment:

Keep electronics off of bows



PC17

Name: Patrick Cebuhar

Community of Residence: Fulton County, Illinois

Comment:

“I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.” Bowhunting is a close-range traditional sport. No high-tech optics should be needed or allowed.



PC18

Name: Santa Claus

Community of Residence: North Pole, Alaska

Comment:

Board Members: I agree with the Northern Alaska Environmental Center that:

- Your Board should take NO ACTION on Proposal 4.
- Proposal 4 is premature because the Ambler Road has not been built and key route, access, litigation, and management questions remain unresolved.

- The proposed road would already be private, gated, and closed to public travel, so a broad hunting and trapping closure is unnecessary at this stage.

- The proposal does not address the real risks of the Ambler Road to fish, wildlife, habitat, wetlands, rivers, subsistence resources, and affected communities.

- Any future management decisions must be shaped through meaningful consultation with affected Tribes, rural communities, local users, and people with long-standing relationships to the lands and waters along the corridor.

Thank you for your consideration.



PC19

Name: Todd Clyncke

Community of Residence: Broomfield

Comment:

I oppose the Archery Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during this special meeting. I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this issue.



PC20

Name: Marvin Clyncke

Community of Residence: Colorado

Comment:

NO ELECTRONICS belong in archery seasons. Bowhunting has always been a way to challenge the hunter and equal out the hunter/prey relationship. Please vote these proposals down.



PC21

Name: Beck Coggeshall

Community of Residence: South Carolina

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation,



PC22

Name: Eric Cooper

Community of Residence: Fairbanks

Comment:

Non electric bow scopes. Seems silly. Just practice more with your bow. Don't allow for mediocre shooters to be out in the woods.



PC23

Name: Todd Craig

Community of Residence: Rapid City, South Dakota

Comment:

I oppose proposal 2 and 3.

I believe we don't need to have any more technology introduced in the archery hunting opportunities, that already exists.



PC24

Name: Jack Culpepper

Community of Residence: Texas

Comment:

I oppose proposal two and three. As a bowhunter we don't need to add more technology to our weapons. We should be at the table to discuss these issues early with fish and game.



PC25

Name: Winston Davies

Community of Residence: Wrangell

Comment:

Addressing the changes to archery equipment. I don't understand why these proposals are being taken up out of cycle. None of these are emergencies. As a member of our local ac, and a commercial fisherman, as many of our local are, there is no way we could meet to discuss these changes and submit our comments to the board. This is a BAD LOOK for the board. These are very sensitive topics in the archery realm, and need to be discussed and debated during the normal board cycle so EVERYONE has time to chime in. THIS LOOKS VERY SHADY.

Thank you for your time.

Winston Davies



PC26

Name: William DeWoody

Community of Residence: Allen, Texas

Comment:

I oppose amendment 2 and 3



PC27

Name: Temple Dillard

Community of Residence: Fairbanks

Comment:

The Ambler road should not go in. If it goes in the companies making money on extraction via its use must pay the state well for it. And if it goes in, Alaskans should be able to use the road to access the hunting, fishing, and trapping such a road would traverse. But it should not go in.



PC28

Name: Toby Dobson

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

I oppose proposition 4. All public lands should remain available for hunting irregardless of a private road in the vicinity. Hunting regulations already exist for all roads.



July 13, 2026

Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Re: Public Comments in Support of Proposed Amendments to 5 AAC 92.510 and 5 AAC 92.550 Regarding Hunting and Trapping in the Vicinity of the Ambler Road

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game:

Doyon, Limited (Doyon) appreciates the opportunity to comment on Proposal 4 for the Alaska Board of Game's Interior Region meeting to be held in Fairbanks, Alaska on June 22-23, 2026.

Doyon is the State-chartered ANCSA Regional Corporation for Interior Alaska and the largest private landowner in the State. Doyon has over 20,000 shareholders, with many shareholders living along the proposed Ambler Road in the villages of Alatna, Allakaket, Bettles, Evansville, Hughes, and Huslia.

Doyon submits these comments in support of the Board of Game's proposed regulation changes addressing the use and taking of game in Game Management Units 23, 24, and 26(B), including the proposed amendments to 5 AAC 92.510 regarding hunting in the vicinity of the proposed Ambler Road and 5 AAC 92.550 regarding trapping in the vicinity of the proposed Ambler Road.

Doyon supports these proposed changes because they will promote the safety of road users, hunters, trappers, nearby communities, and others who may be present in the vicinity of the proposed road corridor. Furthermore, the proposal also assures that the Ambler Road, as expected to be built, will act as intended for both the public and the State of Alaska; the road will remain a private, industrial, commercial-use-only road, and the Board's adoption of this proposal limits pressure trespass of non-commercial traffic on the road.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Obed
Senior Vice President, External Affairs



PC30

Name: Ben Dubbe

Community of Residence: Homer

Comment:

I oppose 5AAC92.510 and 5AAC92.550 that propose to close hunting and trapping along the planned Ambler Road.

These proposals would take away approximately 420 square miles of access and set precedent for the future. Taking away opportunity from the people of Alaska while providing no benefit to game populations is contrary to the state constitution and the stated goals of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. These proposals essentially amount to the privatization of a public resource through lack of access.



PC31

Name: Roger Dunbar

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

“I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska’s normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.



PC32

Name: Jeffry Evans

Community of Residence: Kentucky

Comment:

I oppose what you’re trying to do with 2 and 3



PC33

Name: Dan Evenson

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

I urge you to make no changes and to no accept proposals 2 and 3. Technological advances on archery equipment are going too far from the archery roots and should not be allowed during archery hunts. These things give the hunter an unfair advantage, and will lead to higher success and ultimately lower hunter opportunities someday when seasons have to be adjusted due to the efficiency of the hunter's equipment.



PC34

Name: Tad Farmer

Community of Residence: Freeland

Comment:

Opposed to regulation change. Would undermine the integrity of traditional hunting



PC35

Name: Preston Farrior, Ferman Motor Car Co

Community of Residence: Florida

Comment:

I would first like to acknowledge the difficult position the Board faces. As someone who serves in the same capacity for the State of Florida, I can appreciate the responsibility of balancing wildlife management, conservation, and public interests.

As a lifelong bowhunter, Alaska is more than a destination—it is the last great frontier. Its vast, untamed landscapes and abundant wildlife have inspired generations of hunters, young and old, to pursue the adventure of a lifetime. The traditions and experiences that Alaska provides are unlike any found elsewhere, and they deserve thoughtful stewardship.

For that reason, I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and respectfully urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during this special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's established regulatory process, where they can receive thorough public review, meaningful stakeholder participation, and careful consideration of their long-term implications.

**PC36****Name:** Charles Feldmann**Community of Residence:** Arizona**Comment:**

I support restrictions on archery equipment, the reason for generous archery seasons was because basic archery is a primitive weapon which makes success more difficult. I believe that allowing scopes, range finders and electronic sights will increase the success rate and therefor shortening seasons. I think that following the Pope and Youngs fair chase format is the appropriate way to go.

Thank you for considering my input,

**PC37****Name:** Jeff Finn**Community of Residence:** Englewood, Colorado**Comment:**

As a traditional bowhunter with Alaska on my dream bucket list, i am writing to strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. These proposed changes would undermine the concept of fair chase and erode the woodsmanship skills sorely lacking in much of today's hunting world. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. thank you

**PC38****Name:** Patrick Finney**Community of Residence:** Cuba, Missouri**Comment:**

Dear Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing in opposition to proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal. I would agree wholeheartedly with the Department of Fish and Game that "technology has improved," which is one of the reasons given for the proposals in the Staff comments. Because technology has improved is exactly why these proposals should be abandoned. Protecting a true achery-only restricted program with limited technology is crucial to ensuring high-quality hunting and maximum opportunity for all, now and in the future.

Staff comments also state that "...the department has no way to estimate the increase, if any, in harvest if this proposal were adopted." There will undoubtedly be in an increase in harvest which will eventually affect tag allocations. More technology=less opportunity. That eventually becomes true in every state, every time. The Board of Game has to decide whether the priority is to increase lethality or increase opportunity. You cannot have both, at least not long-term.

I would also caution the comparison to other state regulations such as Montana, Idaho etc. even though some of that data supports my position. Alaska is a singular place with no other peer in the lower 48. I am a non-resident moose hunter who hunts with a longbow, and I feel beyond privileged to have the opportunity to purchase a moose tag every year, over-the-counter. To put that in perspective, it would take a minimum of 30 years of applications to draw a non-resident moose tag in Maine or Colorado, if I started applying today. There are many reasons why this is the case, but increased technology is one of them, and one of the few things that the Board of Game has maximum control over.

I have been hunting for 33 years, and I have only seen hunting opportunities diminish and tag costs sky-rocket during the course of my career. Alaska is the last state that still welcomes non-resident hunters (at least that has been my experience), and still provides tags at reasonable fees with great opportunity. Moose hunting in Alaska has been one of the highlights of my life, even when I did not take an animal. The amount of space, wilderness experience, and unparalleled opportunity cannot be replicated anywhere in the world, I would argue. More technology in ANY season will only degrade this fact.

Again, is the priority lethality or opportunity? For the sake of future generations, resident and non-resident alike, please choose opportunity.

Thank you for considering my comments.



PC39

Name: John Frost

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

First and most importantly I would Protest that there is no valid reason to hold this "Emergency Meeting". The staff of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game should be required to abide by the rather stringent regulations, deadlines and procedures that is imposed on the general public for submission of Proposals. Specifically, Proposal #1 regarding non-intensive Brown Bear harvest in unit 26B could and should have been proposed prior to May 1, 2026 and included in the regular cycle for the next Interior and Eastern Arctic Region meeting to be held in Fairbanks March 2027. This would have given the public and Regional Advisory Committees adequate time to review and comment on the proposal. Proposals #2&3 regarding use of verifiers and scopes on archery gear are certainly not emergencies and could have been held off until the next Statewide meeting. Finally, Proposal #4 to close an unknown area of State Land to hunting for

the benefit of a commercial mining company is, in my opinion, Outrageous. It should NOT be a function of the Department of Fish and Game to close State Land to hunting and trapping. To include this proposal in an "Emergency Meeting" smacks strongly of a purely political move done to please a private company. It is not even clear to me that the exact route of the proposed Ambler Road has been defined. I do know that it must cross the Alatna River somewhere. Will the closure apply to subsistence hunting and trapping as well as public hunting and trapping? How do the people of Alakaket feel about this closure? I hear they are not very happy with the road itself. All of these proposals should be postponed until a more appropriate time in the normal cycle to allow proper public scrutiny.

Having stated the above opposition to dealing with any of these proposals at this time, I will now offer my thoughts on each proposal, on the chance that the Board of Game will proceed anyway.

Proposal #1 SUPPORT as long as it is a small number of bear that have been specifically identified as targeting muskox

Proposal #2 SUPPORT I am exclusively a bowhunter but am now 80 years of age. My vision is not what it once was. I use 3.0 power reading glasses. Using a clarifying lens in my peep sight simply makes my sights clearer, so I am more confident of making a clean ethical shot. It does not increase my range or my ability to hit my target. They should be allowed.

Proposal #3 OPPOSE After carefully reading of both proposals #2&3, the only difference that I can perceive is that #3 would allow range finding scope sights and electronically enhanced sights (would this include infrared or night vision scopes) I am opposed to them.

Proposal #4 OPPOSE I have lived in Alaska for over 50 years. I have seen a progressive erosion of public hunting ground for various excuses. But this is the first time that I have seen closing public hunting specifically to enhance a Private Company. This is a political potentially corrupt situation, which would be better dealt with by the Alaska Legislature than snuck through the Board of Game.. I have personal knowledge and use of the affected area. It is a game rich, accessible area. There is no valid reason why the private mining company needs a 1 mile wide buffer of no hunting or trapping on both sides of their road. In the case of the Dalton Highway there was concern about high-power rifles damaging the pipeline. But there is no pipeline on the proposed Ambler Road.

Even if the State wishes to Grant a special use corridor to a private company, there is no reason to close hunting and trapping in that area. If nothing else the area could be made conventional bowhunting only similar to that on the Dalton Highway.

**PC40**

Name: Christopher Gibbons

Community of Residence: Keaton, Kentucky

Comment:

I see this as expanding the archery season, by being more inclusive of the tech the younger generation of archers are using in other places. I got to visit Alaska last fall and would love to bow hunt there. I have undergone three rotator surgeries and required a cross bow to archery hunt for years. I have built up enough strength to shoot a 45# long bow and recurve. I could hunt deer with that, but would need a crossbow for any larger game. Being a traditional archer, who has had to use modern equipment, i have llearned that at heart, all archers of all types of equipment share the same base love of the woods and hunting. These changes don't stop people from choosing traditional methods, they just allow others to use more modern tech gear.

Bottom line is this, "Hunt and let Hunt". You hunt they style of archery you prefer, and let others do the same. Don't divide archers by pitting one against another. Be glad someone else can use the gear they choose.

**PC41**

Name: Bradley Golden

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

I oppose Proposal 4. Approving restrictions on a speculative road does not make sense and makes for a concerning precedent.



PC42

Name: John Haines

Community of Residence: Indiana

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. We do not need more electronics in bow hunting!!

I think the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public input.

I also oppose the Ambler Road project and believe it needs more environmental study on the roads long term impact on wildlife!!



PC43

Name: Karl Hall, Nashville Sportsman

Community of Residence: Clarksville, Tennessee

Comment:

Concerned hunter who want to support and maintain the skills associated with fair chase and (archery) bow hunting.



PC44

Name: Kathy Harris

Community of Residence: Wasilla, Alaska

Comment:

I am opposed to this special meeting and specifically to proposals 2 & 3.

Proposals of this magnitude should not be decided through a special meeting outside the normal regulatory cycle.

Special meetings should be reserved for truly urgent matters that cannot reasonably wait until the next regularly scheduled meeting—not broad policy changes that could permanently affect Alaska's archery-only hunting opportunities.

Additional items of concern regarding this special meeting are as follows:

1. This Special Meeting is scheduled Wednesday & Thursday in the middle of the week during Alaskans height of summer activities and work week. To my knowledge, all past Board of Game meetings regarding these types of proposals have been scheduled on weekends and followed the standard regulatory process.

2. Response and comment deadline for this Special Meeting is 8 AM on a weekday. To my knowledge the deadline has always been at midnight.

3. At this time now, July 15th evening before the deadline for comments by July 16th at 8 AM, the Alaska Department of Fish & Games website is experiencing technical difficulties and is inaccessible for any information including the Special Meeting, all the details and link to comment.

I respectfully ask that the Board of Game to take no action on these proposals and require them to go through the normal public proposal process.

Sincerely,

Kathy Harris

Wasilla Alaska



PC45

Name: Mary Hausler

Community of Residence: Juneau

Comment:

To the Board of Game:

I do not support proposal 4 which would close a corridor along the proposed Ambler road. I think this action is premature. The road has not been built, faces legal challenges and may not be built, the route could change, etc. What this proposal fails to address is the more important question of what effects building an industrial road through wilderness and its impacts on fish, wildlife, rivers, subsistence, wetlands, and communities in the region. Making this management decision for a non-existent road doesn't make any sense.

Any future management decision should only be made after meaningful consultation with local tribes, subsistence users, local communities, biologists, and others who have lived and stewarded these lands and waters for decades or generations.

The sensible thing to do is to take no action on this proposal, there are too many unresolved questions.

Mary Hausler

Juneau, Alaska



PC46

Name: Tony Heil

Community of Residence: Wausau, Wisconsin

Comment:

“I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska’s normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.”



PC47

Name: Isaac Henry

Community of Residence: Tok

Comment:

I am opposed to propositions #2 and 3 of the upcoming special meeting. As a life-long bowhunter, I am opposed to the "slippery slope" that is advancing technology that undermines what archery hunting is all about: A short-distance hunting method that becomes irrelevant the more technology makes it easier. If long-distance shooting is the goal, then a hunting rifle should work fine.

Additionally, I question the motivation of this being taken up in a special meeting just prior to the fall hunting seasons. It smells like special interest for a specific hunter or influence from private industry that sell this technology.



PC48

Name: Robert Hidding, Blackhawk Molding

Community of Residence: Illinois

Comment:

not a big fan of option #3

I am a traditional bow hunter myself.



PC49

Name: Bruce Hoch

Community of Residence: Colorado

Comment:

I oppose proposals 2&3 because this will be another nail in the coffin of archery hunting.

Just like what crossbows have done to archery hunting everywhere .

If you pass this you will hurt the big game population and that will then hit you in the pocket book.PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS PASS!!!



PC50

Name: Paul Hopkins

Community of Residence: Metamora

Comment:

Please consider that archery seasons should be predicated on requiring woodsmanship and skill over technological crutches. I oppose the introduction of more electronic gizmos into archery equipment structures.



PC51

Name: Gerald Hunter

Community of Residence: Larsen, Wisconsin

Comment:

Please oppose rule 2 and 3 as changes to the equipment in archery seasons. Also only use the normal regulatory process to make changes to hunting laws



PC52

Name: Indiana Bowhunters Association

Community of Residence: Indianapolis, Indiana

Comment:

The Indiana Bowhunters Association on behalf of our members who archery hunt in Alaska oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. We do not need more electronics in bow hunting!

We believe the Board should consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

These rule changes affect Alaskans and residents of the lower 48 who enjoy traditional bowhunting on public land in Alaska. These rule changes are not needed.



PC53

Name: Chris Jasmine, Compton Traditional Bowhunters

Community of Residence: USA

Comment:

Recommendation:

Compton Traditional Bowhunters formally OPPOSES Proposals 2 and 3 and urges the Alaska Board of Game to take NO ACTION on either proposal during the special meeting.

Further CTB encourages the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Rational:

For decades, organizations such as the Alaskan Bowhunters Association and Compton Traditional Bowhunters have worked to preserve and promote the values of traditional bowhunting while advocating for additional opportunity based on the unique challenges and limitations of archery equipment. Those efforts have helped establish the credibility of bowhunters as a distinct user group deserving of specialized seasons and opportunities. Proposals 2 and 3 threaten to undermine that foundation and could make future efforts to expand or defend archery-only hunting opportunity significantly more difficult.

As the nation's leading organization dedicated to preserving traditional bowhunting, Compton Traditional Bowhunters has consistently championed the principles of fair chase, personal skill, and equipment restraint. While these proposals would affect all bowhunters in Alaska, they represent a significant shift away from those principles by authorizing increasingly advanced sighting technology during restricted archery hunts.



PC54

Name: Josh Jenkins

Community of Residence: Indiana

Comment:

I strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3. As a traditional archer I plan to travel and bow hunt Alaska in the future and do not wish to compete with electronics. Bow hunting is supposed to be hard, electronics are diluting the challenge of pursuing game. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. God bless



PC55

Name: Tom Jenkins, Professional Bowhunters Society

Community of Residence: Kentucky

Comment:

I strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and respectfully urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during this special meeting. I also encourage the Board to address any future changes to Alaska's archery equipment regulations only through the state's established regulatory process, where they can receive thorough public review, meaningful stakeholder participation, and careful consideration.



PC56

Name: Larry Jones

Community of Residence: DuQuoin, Illinois

Comment:

Please don't allow electronic devices in archery season. Keep archery hunting a primitive sport



PC57

Name: Thom Jorgensen

Community of Residence: Spring Lake, Michigan

Comment:

As a devout bowhunter I oppose Proposals 2 and 3.

I also urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting.

I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.



PC58

Name: David Joyce

Community of Residence: Tennessee

Comment:

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation." The change of these items would further degrade the tradition of using primitive weapons, everything does not have to be technology driven. Keep hunting a sacred tradition.



PC59

Name: David Kabella

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

Us Alaskans are already severely constrained on access to our state for recreational purposes. The use of public lands, resources and/or funds for projects that further limit Alaskans access to our lands is a miss use of funds. I don't support the Amber's Road unless it opens access to lands also for hunting, fishing, motorized vehicle trails and camping.



PC60

Name: David Kauzlarich

Community of Residence: North Pole

Comment:

I am opposing Article 1 section 2.3, regarding closing hunting and fishing within a 2 mile corridor of the Ambler road. The Alaska state constitution clearly states the resources of Alaska are meant for the residents. As more and more federal lands that should actually be under state control are closed to hunting, it is becoming more difficult and competitive to find moose and caribou to feed my family. I moved here 4 years ago to be a part of the last frontier. My wife plays a vital role in healthcare and I contribute to the public transportation and EMS vehicles being maintained as a City of Fairbanks employee. What will potentially happen as more and more restrictions are imposed and land taken away is people will move away. The Ambler road will provide hunting and fishing along with foraging that will help offset the extremely high cost of living that we are experiencing. If the road is built it should be open to AK residents to access lands for the benefits of our families.



PC61

Name: Dan Keleher

Community of Residence: New Hampshire

Comment:

I will keep this brief.

I am a bowhunter from New Hampshire. I have been to Alaska and look forward to coming back again. As such:

I support Proposal 1.

I oppose Proposals 2, 3, and 4 and ask the Board to take no action on these three during your special meeting.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

**PC62**

Name: John Kleinsmith, Alaska Bowhunters

Community of Residence: Chugiak, Alaska

Comment:

Let's not turn primitive weapons into modern ones. They're already becoming that within the current regulations. It should be hard to succeed at taking Alaskan Big Game with a bow.

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."

**PC63**

Name: Grant Kopplin

Community of Residence: Palmer

Comment:

I am writing to comment in opposition to creating a 2 mile wide, no hunting corridor on the ambler Road. The average Alaskan is very limited where they can access in our state if they do not own an airplane or a large boat. the creation of the ambler Road would give the average Alaska resident access to hunt in a much larger portion of their home state. If this proposal was to limit nonresident hunting opportunity in this area or to prevent commercial operators from starting up from the road like transporters, then I would be in support of that but the average resident needs more access and hunting opportunities, not less. And restricting hunting opportunity along this new road would take away really the only benefit this road provides to the average Alaskan.

**PC64**

Name: Duane Krones, Professional Bowhunters Society

Community of Residence: Osage, Iowa

Comment:

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation." The essence and purity of Bowhunting should be allowed to exist and be insulated from technical shortcuts that substitute woodsman-ship for shortcuts. Shortcuts causing the unacceptable pushing of

boundaries beyond the intentions of Bowhunting and the equipment used. There is enough technology in Bowhunting. There can be no reason for this proposed legislation beyond the special interests of high tech gadgets and lobbying power. Please stand firm against this proposed legislation for the good of Bowhunting.... You can't make a better bowhunter with gadgets. Knowledge through experience and mentorship builds quality Bowhunters. We don't need more Bowhunters attracted to bowhunting by unlimited gadgets that turn a bow into something unrecognizable.... We need better bowhunters.... Do the right thing.... say no to tech..



PC65

Name: Tony Lail, Compton Traditional Bowhunters

Community of Residence: Vale, North Carolina

Comment:

I urge you to take no action on Proposal 2 and 3 as it would be a great detriment to Traditional Bowhunting and bowhunting in general. Thank you



PC66

Name: Zachary Larsen

Community of Residence: Arizona, but I've lived in and worked out of King Salmon for several years

Comment:

I strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. It is my view as a long time archery hunter that the allowable technology for archery seasons must remain substantially limited to preserve the integrity and intent of the season. Allowing scopes and enhanced optics on archery equipment only serves to narrow the gap and effective range between primitive and non primitive weapons and will create a scenario where at some point there will be no justification to have a separate season for primitive weapons. What would Jay Massey do?



PC67

Name: Joe Lasch

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to the proposals 2 and 3 which would expand allowable archery equipment to allow the use of electronic range finding sights, scopes and other high tech equipment. Bowhunting should remain a low impact method of hunting, and expanding allowable equipment only serves to make it easier to harvest animals, this putting even more pressure on wildlife that is already threat. Alaska needs to protect the resources you have and encourage fair chase hunting methods, not expose them to ever more efficient means of harvest.



PC68

Name: Raymond Latty, Compton

Community of Residence: Georgia

Comment:

Keep primitive seasons primitive!!



PC69

Name: Raymond Lyon

Community of Residence: Traverse City, Michigan USA

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. Hunting the wilds of Alaska is just that, man against nature. Archery hunting seasons were designed and meant to be for 'primitive' weapons. Here in Michigan, the Natural Resources Commission just reduced the ability to harvest whitetail deer in part because of the technology that has infiltrated archery deer season.

**PC70**

Name: Kevin Mackie, Professional Bowhunters Society

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

I do not support 2 or 3 and urge the Alaskan game department disregard those proposals. And any future changes of archery proposals to be reviewed before the public and game department to keep it pure and primitive.

**PC71**

Name: Joe Marsala Jr.

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

I'm writing to implore you to take no action on Proposal 4.

Proposal 4 is premature because the Ambler Road has not been built and key route, access, litigation, and management questions remain unresolved.

The proposed road would already be private, gated, and closed to public travel, so a broad hunting and trapping closure is unnecessary at this stage.

The proposal does not address the real risks of the Ambler Road to fish, wildlife, habitat, wetlands, rivers, subsistence resources, and affected communities.

Any future management decisions must be shaped through meaningful consultation with affected Tribes, rural communities, local users, and people with long-standing relationships to the lands and waters along the corridor.

**PC72**

Name: Randall Martin, Compton traditional bowhunters

Community of Residence: Ohio

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

**PC73****Name:** Carol Mauch**Community of Residence:** Bassett**Comment:**

In Nebraska they made the changes you are considering. Too many hunters, too easy with this equipment and many animals taken. Now they have suddenly found our animal population is down 40%. This year cutting licenses way down which amounts to less money for conservation, less for local economy and cutting jobs in the game dept. What has happened to fair chase, the ethical pursuit of a trophy without the gadgets to make it "easier". Political winds should not affect pure wildlife & hunting management

Protect the wildlife dont sell it for corporate dollars.

**PC74****Name:** Steve McCloskey**Community of Residence:** La Luz, New Mexico**Comment:**

I oppose proposals to allow high-tech sighting instruments on restricted archery hunts. Archery is not supposed to be easy. Most proposals such as are being considered are driven by manufacturers hoping to boost sales. Yes, while a resident of New Mexico, I have bow hunted in Alaska.

**PC75****Name:** Kathleen Menke**Community of Residence:** Haines**Comment:**

Proposal 1 (Predator control/muskox).. Oppose.. Evidence from last attempt at such predator control program did not provide either short-term or long term success.. Focus on improving habitat and limiting human harvest to sustain musk-ox populations

Proposal 2 (special equipment for archery hunters).. oppose.. Fair chase does not include use of electronic equipment

Proposals 3 & 4: Ambler Road.. Oppose the Ambler Road itself and oppose limiting subsistence use in this region..



PC76

Name: Professional Bowhunters Society

Community of Residence: Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Comment:

Please help to keep bowhunting a challenging sport not to be cheapened by technology and sights and scopes on archery equipment. Keep archery seasons the primitive sport that it is, please don't capitulate on making bowhunting easy. Hunt the hard way! Traditional bowhunting!



PC77

Name: Stephen Meyers

Community of Residence: Fairbanks

Comment:

Regarding proposal four, I think it is very reasonable to have a larger setback than 1 mile. A 5 mile corridor similar to the DHCMA seems more reasonable.

I would also appreciate further clarification about the planned logistics (and legality) of a private road built on public land.

Will it be lawful to cross the road?

Who will have access to hunt and trap off of this road?

Is it legal or ethical to limit public access to public land based on private employment status or other non-equitable means?



PC78

Name: Michael Mitten, Compton Traditional Bowhunting

Community of Residence: Illinois

Comment:

As a long time nonresident Alaskan bowhunter I strongly oppose Proposition 2 and 3. Allowing electric sights and electronic devices on bows during the archery selective seasons goes against the intent of the rules for special hunts, length of season and reduced impact of harvest .

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME SPECIAL MEETING
July 22-23
Fairbanks

Proposal 1:

I am a resident of Anchorage and have successfully bow hunted musk ox in the past. I am **opposed** to this reauthorization version of a Non Intensive Management Predator Control plan.

In the past, it appears 7 bears were taken between 2012 and 2016. The impact of taking just a few bears was musk ox herd grew after a major drowning event when a population count was performed in 2018. It is unclear how much the reduction of musk ox, a food source for bears, impacted the bear population during this time frame. What is notable is this was accomplished with a maximum of 3 bears being removed in a year, another year 1 bear and another year 3 ears were again removed. Proposing the removal of up to 20 bears per year is too aggressive by any measure and extending the time period to run through June 30, 2034 equates to 160 bears in 8 years. Previously, 7 were taken in 5 years and it had a positive impact on musk ox. **I would support an amendment of taking 5 bears per year for 4 years and then see exactly what effect it has on the musk ox population.**

Proposal 2

I **support** the use on verifiers and clarifiers. I am a life long bow hunter. I am **opposed** to the use of non electronic scopes in hunting big game restricted to archery only. **Please amend to remove non electric scopes.** Scopes of any kind will allow hunters to take longer shots and result in more wounded animals.

Proposal 3

I **support** the use on verifiers and clarifiers. I am a life long bow hunter. I am **opposed** to the use of electronic scopes in hunting big game restricted to archery only. **Please amend to remove the use of electronic scopes (these have built in range finders).** Scopes of any kind will allow hunters to take longer shots and result in more wounded animals.

Proposal 4

I **oppose** the complete closure of a 1 mile corridor on each side of the Ambler road in units 23 and 24. I do not want to see another 422 square miles being removed from hunting. **It should be amended to archery hunting only and trapping only area in this corridor.** There should be no hunting with firearms.

**PC80****Name:** William Moran**Community of Residence:** Massachusetts**Comment:**

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. Please keep primitive seasons primitive!

**PC81****Name:** Jason Morrison**Community of Residence:** Wasilla**Comment:**

To the Alaska Board of Game,

I respectfully submit this comment in opposition to any proposal that would unnecessarily restrict public access or lawful hunting and fishing opportunities along the proposed Ambler Road corridor.

The Alaska Constitution establishes a clear vision for the management of our state's natural resources. Article VIII, Section 1 states that Alaska's natural resources are to be utilized, developed, and conserved for the maximum benefit of its people. Article VIII, Section 3 reserves fish, wildlife, and waters to the people for common use, and Article VIII, Section 15 prohibits the creation of exclusive rights or special privileges of fishery. Together, these provisions reflect a fundamental principle that Alaska's public resources should remain accessible and managed for the benefit of all Alaskans, not just those with greater financial means.

The Ambler Road is proposed to be constructed, in part, using public funding. Alaska residents and American taxpayers will help pay for this infrastructure. It is difficult to justify asking the public to finance a road while simultaneously preventing that same public from using it to access the surrounding public lands. Public investment should result in public benefit.

For many Alaskans, especially working families, roads are the only practical means of reaching remote public lands. Most residents cannot afford to own an aircraft or charter flights into the Brooks Range. Restricting access along the Ambler Road would disproportionately affect ordinary Alaskans while effectively preserving access for those with the financial resources to fly into these areas. This creates an inequity that is inconsistent with the constitutional principle that our natural resources are held for the common use and maximum benefit of all citizens.

Alaska has long recognized hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation as essential parts of our heritage and way of life. Public access to public lands is critical to maintaining those traditions. While responsible wildlife management is essential, restrictions should be based on demonstrated biological necessity and sound science, not on limiting who can access public lands. If conservation concerns arise, they should be addressed through established management tools such as seasons, bag limits, harvest quotas, or other biologically justified regulations that apply equally to all users rather than broad access restrictions.

Restricting access along a publicly funded transportation corridor also establishes a concerning precedent. Future infrastructure projects built with public funds could similarly become inaccessible to the very citizens who paid for them. That outcome is inconsistent with the spirit of Article VIII of the Alaska Constitution and the long-standing expectation that public lands remain available for public use.

I respectfully urge the Board to oppose any proposal that unnecessarily restricts public access or lawful hunting and fishing opportunities associated with the Ambler Road. Decisions affecting Alaska's wildlife and public lands should uphold the constitutional principles of common use, maximum public benefit, equal opportunity, and science-based management.

Thank you for your time, your service, and your careful consideration of these comments.

Respectfully,

Jason Morrison

Wasilla, AK



July 15, 2026

Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Re: NANA's Support for Proposed Amendments to 5AAC 92.510 and 5 AAC 92.550

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game:

NANA Regional Corporation (NANA) supports proposed regulations changes 5AAC 92.510 and 5 AAC 92.550 which would establish a no-hunting and no-trapping corridor within 1 mile from each side of the proposed Ambler Road as well as the road surface. These changes will ensure the safety of all hunters, trappers, nearby communities, and road users who may be near the proposed Ambler Road.

NANA is an Alaska Native Corporation established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Ten of 11 village corporations in the NANA region merged with NANA in 1976. NANA manages approximately 2.2 million acres of surface and subsurface estate of the traditional lands of the Iñupiaq people. Per NANA's policies, subsistence is the highest and best use of NANA lands. Approximately 24.6 miles of the proposed Ambler Road project crosses NANA lands and comes near the communities of Kobuk (9 miles), Shungnak (15 miles) and Ambler (22 miles).

The proposed Ambler Road is a 211-mile industrial use road that will include heavy equipment, commercial, and other vehicles some of which require longer stopping distances. These regulation changes will ensure that there are clear, practical rules for safe travel for both industrial road users and hunters and trappers operating in the vicinity of the road. Though NANA supports the regulation changes, NANA also supports consideration of reducing the width of the no-hunting corridor to minimize impacts on the traditional and customary use of hunters and trappers from Kobuk, Shungnak, and Ambler while not sacrificing the intent to create a clear, practical rules for road users and those subsisting off the land.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Cravalho
Vice President, Lands



PC83

Name: Josh Nash

Community of Residence: Byron, Nebraska

Comment:

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. As a traditional bowhunter I encourage you to maintain the primitive guidelines that safeguard traditional hunting. I also encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.



PC84

Name: Ron Niziolek

Community of Residence: Wyoming

Comment:

Please do not make proposed changes to archery restrictions.



PC85

Name: Scott Nolletti, Compton Traditional Bowhunters

Community of Residence: Ohio

Comment:

I along with fellow members of Compton Traditional Bowhunters oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."

Respectfully,

Scott Nolletti



Northern Alaska Chapter SCI
PO Box 60202
Fairbanks, AK, 99706
SCINorthernAlaska@gmail.com

15 July 2026

Alaska Board of Game
Jake Fletcher, Chair
via email [REDACTED]

Subject: Comments on Proposals 1-4 for the special Board of Game meeting July 22-23, 2026

Please enter the following statements into the record on behalf of our chapter:

Proposal 1: Our Chapter supports reinstating the non-intensive management predator control for muskoxen in Unit 26B. This program has helped increase the muskoxen population in the past and is a valuable management tool to help the population increase again. Increasing the muskox population would provide more opportunities for hunters to harvest animals in the future.

Proposal 2: The Northern Alaska Chapter of SCI supports the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only. This archery equipment will benefit those that have compromised vision and may help with better shot placement when harvesting animals with archery equipment. There is no evidence of over harvest that occurs in archery only hunts in Alaska or that archery hunts are detrimental to game populations. Allowing the use of this additional equipment will likely not change that.

Proposal 3: The Northern Alaska Chapter of SCI supports the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and electronic scopes to be used in big game hunts limited to take by bow and arrow only. This archery equipment will benefit those that have compromised vision and may help with better shot placement when harvesting animals with archery equipment. There is no evidence of over harvest that occurs in archery only hunts in Alaska or that archery hunts are detrimental to game populations. Allowing the use of this additional equipment will likely not change that.

Proposal 4: The Northern Alaska Chapter of SCI opposes the 2-mile-wide closure of hunting and trapping along the Ambler road. We support science-based wildlife management, not politically based wildlife management. ADF&G admits there is no biological concern for the wildlife species in the area. Wildlife populations are managed for trapping and hunting along road systems across all of North America. This area is no different than anywhere else in Alaska. Modern day wildlife management has techniques to protect populations from over harvest from trapping and hunting.

We find it extremely disappointing to see the politics of a road insert itself into wildlife management in Alaska.

Sincerely,

Tony Hollis
Chapter President
Northern Alaska Chapter SCI



July 15, 2026

Attn: Jake Fletcher, Chair
Stosh Hoffman, Vice Chair
Allen Barrette, Board Member
David Loring, Board Member
James Baichtal, Board Member
Jake Garner, Board Member
Carri Ann Mueller, Board Member

Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Submitted electronically through the Alaska Board of Game public-comment portal:
<https://survey123.arcgis.com/share/7edf34720c3f45d9b878c3c7a0251d13>

Re: Northern Alaska Environmental Center Comments on Proposals 1 and 4

Dear Chair Fletcher, Vice Chair Hoffman, and Members of the Alaska Board of Game:

The Northern Alaska Environmental Center submits these comments on Proposals 1 and 4 for the Board's July 22–23, 2026 special meeting.

NAEC supports wildlife management grounded in current data, transparent analysis, ecological integrity, and meaningful consideration of subsistence users and affected communities. NAEC has also historically opposed aerial and agency predator-control programs that seek to increase harvestable prey populations through lethal removal of native predators.

For the reasons explained below, NAEC opposes Proposal 1 as written and urges the Board to take no action on Proposal 4.

Proposal 1: Unit 26B Muskox Predator-Control Plan

Proposal 1 would reauthorize a non-intensive management predator-control plan in Unit 26B through June 30, 2034. The plan would allow Alaska Department of Fish and Game employees or state agents to

830 College Road
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701-1535
(907) 452-5021
www.northern.org
EIN: 23-7438038



lethally remove brown bears associated with muskox predation during the calving and post-calving period. Authorized methods could include aerial, land-and-shoot, helicopter-assisted, and ground-based removal.

The proposal establishes a population objective of at least 300 muskoxen one year old or older and a future harvest objective of three to nine muskoxen annually once a harvestable surplus is available. The regulatory language would allow the removal of brown bears identified as threatening or killing muskoxen while attempting to maintain the broader Unit 26B bear population.

NAEC recognizes that the Unit 26B muskox decline is serious and that brown bear predation is an important source of mortality. However, the record does not demonstrate that an eight-year lethal predator-control authorization is the most effective or sufficiently supported response to the current decline.

The population decline requires a broader demographic analysis

The Unit 26B muskox population increased from approximately 122 animals in 1990 to about 330 in 1995. It remained generally between 265 and 300 through 2003, then declined to approximately 216 by 2006. During 2007–2011, the population remained near 200 animals.

The population began increasing again in 2018, exceeded the management objective of 300 by 2020, and supported renewed hunting opportunity. Since 2023, however, the population has declined significantly. The April 2026 estimate was approximately 220 muskoxen.

Those figures warrant concern, but the proposal does not provide the complete annual population estimates, confidence intervals, sightability corrections, age and sex composition, calf production, short-yearling recruitment, adult female survival, movement data, or annual cause-specific mortality needed to independently evaluate the present decline.

Because this is a small population, relatively minor changes in adult female survival, calf recruitment, emigration, hunting mortality, or stochastic events can strongly affect the population trend. The Board should review the full demographic record rather than relying on summary statements that bear predation has returned to previous levels.

Brown bear predation is significant but does not explain the entire trend

During ADF&G's 2007–2011 research period, brown bears were attributed 62 percent of documented adult muskox mortality and 58 percent of calf mortality for which a cause was identified. The



department documented an average of nine adult and five calf deaths annually from bear predation. However, 74 calves were classified as missing, and their fates were not confirmed.

ADF&G also reported that 74 percent of the adults killed by bears were females, which is important because adult female survival is particularly influential in a small, slow-reproducing population. Other known adult mortality included vehicle collisions and illegal take, drowning, and disease, while 19 percent of adult mortality was not assigned to a cause.

These findings show that individual bears can substantially affect muskox groups, particularly when adult females are killed. They do not establish that predation is the sole or ultimate cause of the current population decline. Predation may interact with nutrition, disease, habitat conditions, weather, disturbance, body condition, harvest, and other sources of mortality.

The prior control program produced mixed and inconclusive results

Between 2012 and 2016, ADF&G removed seven male brown bears associated with muskox predation or predatory behavior. During the control period, documented adult mortality from bear predation declined from an average of nine animals annually to approximately two annually. Summer calf survival increased from 63 percent during the earlier research period to 77 percent during the removal program.

However, annual calf survival and recruitment into the short-yearling class did not clearly improve, and the population did not grow while predator control was active. A single drowning event killed approximately 11 percent of the herd, further complicating the assessment. ADF&G ultimately suspended the program for reevaluation.

ADF&G now suggests that the population increase beginning in 2018 may have been a delayed result of removing a small number of specialist bears. The department characterizes that conclusion as plausible and acknowledges that the drowning event, small population size, and difficulty detecting demographic changes made the effect difficult to determine.

The prior program therefore demonstrated that targeted bear removal can reduce observed predation. It did not establish that lethal removal caused sustained population recovery. Reauthorizing the program through 2034 would extend an experimental intervention without resolving the uncertainty identified during the first effort.

Nutrition, disease, habitat, weather, and harvest remain unresolved



ADF&G's earlier research found potentially suboptimal trace-mineral concentrations in Unit 26B muskoxen, including low copper and selenium and elevated zinc and iron. The department acknowledged that these imbalances could affect immune function, increase vulnerability to disease, and make muskoxen more susceptible to predation. It further acknowledged that habitat limitations may have been obscured by high mortality.

The current proposal does not provide updated information on trace-mineral status, disease exposure, body condition, winter forage, icing events, snow conditions, habitat change, human disturbance, or the effects of the renewed hunts established after 2020. These factors should be evaluated alongside predation before the Board authorizes another long-term lethal-control program.

The brown bear population information is also outdated. The most recent Unit 26B bear abundance estimate cited by ADF&G comes from surveys conducted between 1999 and 2003. ADF&G estimated 243–423 adult brown bears and currently manages for an annual harvest of 27 bears. The department reports a recent combined average human-caused take of approximately 19 bears per year.

A predator-control program extending through 2034 should not rely on a bear abundance estimate that will be more than 30 years old by the end of the authorization. Updated abundance, sex composition, survival, recruitment, and cumulative human-caused mortality data are necessary to determine whether additional agency removals would remain sustainable.

Requested action on Proposal 1

NAEC requests that the Board reject Proposal 1 as written.

Before considering renewed lethal control, ADF&G should publicly provide its complete 2020–2026 muskox population, composition, recruitment, collar, movement, mortality, nutrition, disease, and body-condition data. The department should also update the Unit 26B brown bear population estimate and develop a transparent population model comparing continued monitoring, muskox harvest reductions, nonlethal intervention, targeted removal, and no action.

While the muskox population remains below the management objective, the Board should prioritize protection of adult females, review existing hunting opportunity, continue monitoring suspected specialist bears, and investigate nutritional, disease, weather, habitat, and disturbance-related factors.

If the Board nevertheless authorizes lethal removal, the program should be limited to individually verified repeat predators, prohibit generalized bear reduction, include a substantially shorter sunset



date, and require detailed annual public reporting. Removal should automatically stop if measurable improvements in adult female survival, calf recruitment, or overall population growth are not detected within a predetermined period.

Proposal 4: Proposed Ambler Road Hunting and Trapping Corridor

Proposal 4 would close hunting and trapping within one mile of each side of the proposed 211-mile Ambler Road in Game Management Units 23 and 24. The resulting two-mile-wide corridor would encompass approximately 420 square miles. Hunters and trappers could cross the corridor to reach open areas but could not harvest wildlife within it.

NAEC urges the Board to take no action on Proposal 4.

The proposal is premature

The Ambler Road has not been constructed. Its final route, legal status, construction schedule, access arrangements, associated spur roads, enforcement structure, and long-term operating conditions remain uncertain.

The proposal describes the road as a private commercial road controlled by a locked gate staffed continuously. If access is restricted to project employees, contractors, and other authorized users, hunting and trapping from the road can be prohibited through project permits, access agreements, employment policies, contractor rules, and direct enforcement.

The Board should not close approximately 420 square miles to hunting and trapping before the road exists and before an actual road-related management problem has been documented.

The proposed closure does not address the road's primary ecological effects

Proposal 4 addresses hunting and trapping but does not address industrial traffic, noise, dust, habitat fragmentation, stream crossings, culverts, erosion, sedimentation, gravel extraction, spills, construction activity, or interference with wildlife movement.

ADF&G states that it has no biological concern for any species as a result of the proposed road and suggests that effects on wildlife movement could be mitigated through temporal and spatial traffic reductions. However, the department's comments do not provide enforceable traffic standards, wildlife-crossing requirements, disturbance thresholds, or road-specific evidence supporting that conclusion. The road would cross the historical winter range of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. ADF&G estimated the herd at approximately 121,000 caribou in 2025, down from roughly 490,000 in 2003. A two-mile



hunting and trapping closure would not address the potential effects of industrial traffic and infrastructure on caribou movement, displacement, migration, or access by nearby communities.

Existing local and subsistence use has not been adequately addressed

The proposed road would cross existing trapline trails, RS 2477 rights-of-way, navigable waters, and other established access routes. ADF&G also acknowledges that active traplines and hunting areas exist within the corridor and that Proposal 4 would eliminate hunting and trapping across approximately 420 square miles.

The affected region supports substantial subsistence use. ADF&G estimates that Ambler, Kobuk, and Shungnak collectively harvest approximately 675 caribou annually. Additional harvest occurs by residents of Selawik, Kiana, Noorvik, Kotzebue, Huslia, and other communities.

Any future decision affecting hunting, trapping, navigable-water access, traditional trails, or established use areas must begin with meaningful consultation with affected Tribes, rural communities, subsistence users, trappers, Native landowners, and other local residents.

ADF&G itself identifies unresolved questions involving spur roads, mining-claim access, navigable waters, permitted activities, and enforcement. The department anticipates that additional regulatory action may be needed after construction and operation begin. Those unresolved issues support deferring action rather than adopting a broad closure now.

The Board must also determine whether the proposal would continue to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses. The present record does not demonstrate that the proposed closure is supported by affected communities or that its effects on traditional access and harvest have been adequately assessed.

Requested action on Proposal 4

NAEC requests that the Board take no action on Proposal 4.

Any future hunting or trapping regulation associated with the Ambler Road should respond to a documented management need, reflect the final road alignment and access system, and follow meaningful consultation with affected Tribes and communities. It should also address employee and contractor conduct, spur roads, navigable waters, traditional trails, enforcement, and protection of local subsistence access.



Taking no action on Proposal 4 does not constitute support for the Ambler Road or indifference to its wildlife impacts. It recognizes that the Board should not impose premature public restrictions that fail to address the road's underlying effects on fish, wildlife, habitat, subsistence, and intact ecosystems.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Krystal Lapp".

Krystal Lapp
Interim Executive Director

References Cited

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2026. *Proposal 1: 5 AAC 92.126(b), Non-Intensive Management Predator Control Plans, Unit 26B Musk Oxen Recovery Area.*

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2026. *Department Comments on Proposal 1: Unit 26B Musk Oxen Recovery Area.*

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2026. *Proposal 4: Areas Closed to Hunting and Areas Closed to Trapping Along the Proposed Ambler Road.*

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2026. *Department Comments on Proposal 4: Proposed Ambler Road Hunting and Trapping Corridor*



PC88

Name: Tim Novak

Community of Residence: North Dakota

Comment:

Archery should not include any electronic or new high tech equipment archery is supposed to be hard to do



PC89

Name: Anthony O'Neill

Community of Residence: Non-resident

Comment:

I vehemently oppose



PC90

Name: John Peeler

Community of Residence: McAlester, Oklahoma

Comment:

I strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Advanced technology has increasingly been introduced into bowhunting seasons across the country. Bowhunting should remain an activity that requires additional skills, experience and woodsmanship. Inclusion of advanced technologies diminishes the skill required to harvest big game animals with a bow and will have an adverse impact on their population. That almost always results in shortened bowhunting seasons and/or reduced bowhunting quotas. I urge you not let that happen in Alaska.

**PC91**

Name: Mark Phillips

Community of Residence: Colorado

Comment:

Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposals 2 and 3, and I urge the Board to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting on July 22nd and 23rd, 2026.

Archery is fundamentally a primitive sport, and its traditional integrity should be preserved. Modern advancements like scopes, sights, and rangefinders are entirely unnecessary for archery hunting. True archery season should be restricted to traditional-style bows without the aid of any attached devices. Allowing these technological advantages blurs the line between bowhunting and firearm hunting.

I strongly encourage the Board to reject both Proposals 2 and 3. Thank you for your time and for considering my input on this matter.

Mark Phillips

**PC92**

Name: Steven Philp

Community of Residence: California

Comment:

As an archery hunter, I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. I also encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

**PC93****Name:** Benjamin Pinney**Community of Residence:** Juneau**Comment:**

I'm am strongly opposed to taking any action on proposal 2 and 3 as these are not urgent and should not have been included in the special meeting. Furthermore archery is meant to be a primitive sport of challenge. I am strongly opposed to allowing any electronic devices on a bow. As a management tool, making bowhunting easier would make quotas easier to fill and ultimately risk the shortening of archery hunting seasons which would create less opportunity for all sportsmen. Regardless, I am surprised that ADF&G would consider proposing non urgent , non conservation issues for a special hearing. Please keep the definition of archery as primitive as it is now and out of special hearings. Thank you.

**PC94****Name:** Steven Pitsch**Community of Residence:** Michigan**Comment:**

Bowhunting is special because of it's tradition of being difficult. Difficult because you have to be up close and personal with the game you are pursuing. Difficult in waiting for an ethical shot and then executing a lethal shot. It takes a lot of practice for Bowhunter's to be proficient in their shot opportunities. Bowhunters typically are ethical, disciplined and efficient with their equipment because of all the practice they put into their passion. They deserve to have the game opportunities available to them without modern technology advancements working their way into the traditional bowhunting equipment season to make it easier to harvest the game and deplete the game animals which depletes the success opportunities for the bowhunters.

**PC95****Name:** Ryan Plummer**Community of Residence:** Missouri**Comment:**

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full

**PC96****Name:** Andy Ponce**Community of Residence:** Oregon**Comment:**

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. This current off-schedule meeting, when many AK residents are getting their food for the winter, is wrong!

**PC97****Name:** Pope and Young Club**Community of Residence:** Montana**Comment:**

The Pope & Young Club opposes recent proposals for amendment of Alaska's bowhunting regulations primarily for two reasons. First, is the proposals being put forth by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is a departure to the normal public notice and comment before proposing an administrative change to the regulations. Second, for the Department of Fish and Game's failure to consult archery and bowhunting stakeholders like the Alaska Bowhunters Association.

While it is the purview of state agencies to adopt biologically sound and practical measures in association with the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation, increasing technologies are increasing harvest rates nationally. These proposals being put forth in unilateral fashion exclude organizations like the Pope & Young Club's participation in the process which brings years of knowledge and experience in these areas. We firmly believe our adopted rules, regulations and tenets of "fair chase bowhunting" should be considered by state agencies, along with sound biological, scientific, and population considerations for the good of the hunting community as a whole regarding regulation setting.

We therefore respectfully request that proposals 2 and 3 be withdrawn and tabled for future consideration in accordance with past practices and public input.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Pope & Young Club.

**PC98****Name:** Tyson Porter**Community of Residence:** North Pole**Comment:**

I am commenting on the ridiculous “proposal 4”. This is absolutely insanity. ADFG directly going after Alaskans rights to access 100’s of square miles of land? After we have lost so much access already. This would be a major mistake. This goes directly against our state constitution where it states Alaskans have the right to access land to hunt and fish. We rely on these resources and likewise the access to the land for our food and lifestyles. Please do not take away these opportunities. Thousands of Alaskans will be harmed by this decision and trust and respect will be lost towards adfg and the BOG. If this wasn’t clear enough I oppose this proposal.

**PC99****Name:** Justin Powell**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks**Comment:**

I am writing to strongly condemn the Alaska Board of Game for even considering Proposal 4. This proposal would impose a sweeping two-mile-wide closure (one mile on each side) to hunting and trapping along the entire length of the proposed Ambler Access Road in Game Management Units 23 and 24. It is a blatant and unnecessary attack on Alaskans’ constitutional rights and on the fundamental values that define our state.

This is not a minor regulatory tweak. It is a preemptive ban on hunting across a vast corridor of public land spanning more than 200 miles — effectively restricting traditional hunting and trapping on hundreds of square miles of our shared public domain. The road itself does not yet exist. Its final alignment remains uncertain, the project faces active litigation, and key questions about route, spurs, access, and management are unresolved. Closing public land to hunting before the road is even built is the height of bureaucratic arrogance and “cart-before-the-horse” governance.

Even more outrageous is the fact that the proposed road is explicitly described as a private, gated, commercial-use-only corridor with 24/7 staffed security. If access is already controlled by the operator, there is zero legitimate need for the State of Alaska to layer on an additional broad hunting and trapping closure. This proposal serves no genuine conservation purpose. It appears instead to be a backdoor effort to further restrict Alaskans’ access to our own public lands under the cover of industrial development.

This proposal is blatantly unconstitutional. Article VIII, Section 3 of the Alaska Constitution reserves fish, wildlife, and waters “to the people for common use.” Our constitutional framers did not envision a Board of Game that would casually strip away broad public access to hunting

on public lands — especially not preemptively, without demonstrated biological necessity, and in service of a still-hypothetical private road. This action directly contradicts the common-use doctrine and the principle that Alaska's wildlife belongs to all Alaskans, not to bureaucrats, special interests, or future industrial operators.

It is also against everything Alaska stands for. Alaska was built on rugged self-reliance, a deep hunting and subsistence heritage, individual liberty, and open access to our vast public lands. We do not lock up hundreds of square miles of hunting country on a whim. We do not punish hunters and trappers — the original and best stewards of our wildlife — to accommodate speculative development. We certainly do not do so while the road remains unbuilt and its impacts unproven. This proposal disrespects rural Alaskans, veterans, older hunters, and anyone who values accessible hunting opportunities. It sets a dangerous precedent that could be used to justify closures around any future project, eroding our birthright of open public access.

Alaska's hunters and trappers fund the vast majority of wildlife conservation through license fees, tags, and federal excise taxes. We deserve better than preemptive, unnecessary closures dreamed up for a road that may never be built.

I demand that the Board of Game reject Proposal 4 outright and take no action. Do not legitimize this premature and unconstitutional restriction. Any legitimate access, safety, or management issues related to a future road can and should be addressed at the appropriate time through site-specific measures developed with real input from affected hunters, trappers, rural communities, and tribes — not through a sweeping, preemptive closure pushed now while the project remains in legal and planning limbo.

I will be submitting these comments through the official portal and intend to follow this matter closely. Alaskans are watching. We expect our Board of Game to defend our constitutional rights and our hunting heritage, not erode them.

Sincerely,

Justin Powell

Fairbanks, Alaska



PC100

Name: George Reel

Community of Residence: Arizona

Comment:

Any electronic aid which is part of the bow or bow sight should not be allowed.



This is my comments concerning regulations limiting hunting within 1 mile of the proposed Ambler Road per Proposal 4.

I would propose that the regulation invites issues concerning access to public lands. As stated, the road is private and accessible only by permission of the owner. As present, the road is intended for commercial use only. If that is in fact the case, there should be no issue with the road being used for hunting access as that is not the commercial purpose for which it was established.

However, given that the road is "private," this regulation by its terms contemplates that the owner or managers could allow access for hunting purposes. This creates numerous issues including the use of motorized vehicles from the road, etc. It also would allow those with a connection to the road's owner or managers access to public lands for hunting purposes that would not be available to the general public. As AIDEA is the one building the road, it will be subject to political pressures to grant access to various interest groups. Ultimately, people traveling to villages in the region may be allowed to use the road creating additional political pressures for permitted access to limited groups. I have not reviewed the agreement between the state and NANA and Doyon, but the content of those agreements and the various potential issues with expanded access for subsistence and sport hunting should be considered at this point. I would posit that state resources should not be used to provide hunting access to some members of the public but not others.

I would propose that the better regulation at this time should not only limit hunting within a mile of the road, it should prohibit hunters from using the road for access for hunting or trapping purposes or at a minimum prohibit the use of motorized vehicles within 5 miles of the road for hunting or trapping purposes as has been established on the Dalton. Likewise, a weapons limitation should be imposed within a 5 mile corridor.

This road was not initially intended for providing hunting access or to grant a private access to hunting lands to some and to the exclusion of others. A prohibition of hunting access from the road is the only safe action to be taken at this time. After the road is developed and operating and its use is understood, then the state could appropriately consider liberalizing the regulations.

As a final thought, wild game requires wilderness to survive and thrive. As has often been recognized, access is the enemy of wilderness. This road has been pushed through by executive order rather than the normal course of permitting required by the various federal and state agencies, but it was done so to provide access to strategic minerals, not to provide hunting access or destroy the wilderness values of the area that it runs through. We need to approach things conservatively because wilderness is the one great asset we have as a state that sets us apart, and once it is gone it will not be restored. We can and should act to preserve those values for the future generations to the extent we can. Prohibiting hunting access from the road will help minimize the impact of the road on the pristine wilderness through which it will run. Then access can be opened if appropriate once the scope of use of the road is understood.

Robert K. Reiman
Anchorage, AK



RESIDENT HUNTERS OF ALASKA

unapologetically FOR ALASKAN RESIDENTS

Working hard to ensure our wildlife is managed sustainably with an emphasis on protecting and enhancing resident hunting opportunities!

www.residenthuntersofalaska.org

July 9, 2026

Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)

Comments to the Alaska Board of Game

Special Meeting: Muskox, Archery, and Ambler Road — July 22-23, 2026

Proposals we support: 1-3

Proposals we oppose: 4

Proposal 4 – 5 AAC 92.510. Areas closed to hunting; and 5 AAC 92.550. Areas closed to trapping. Close a 2-mile-wide corridor along the Ambler Road.

OPPOSE

Why is this Proposal Necessary?

As the proposal states, the *“proposed road is for commercial purposes only, is private, and access to it will be controlled by a locked gate that is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 265 days a year.”*

This begs the question, if the public isn’t allowed to use the road, just who are we trying to keep from hunting and trapping within this proposed corridor? It is typical on these types of projects that contractors and workers and commercial drivers are prohibited from hunting, fishing, or trapping while at remote work camps, working on a project, or transporting materials etc.

The Department should explain to the board what hunter/trapper user groups they are trying to prevent hunting and trapping within the corridor of the proposed road, and why it is necessary at this time.

One example of another private commercial road with access from the state’s road system is the 49-mile-long Pogo Mine Road near Delta Junction. Prior to and after construction of the Pogo Mine Road there was no proposal from the Department to impose a no-hunting/trapping corridor along the road. The reason why is because it wasn’t necessary. The public wouldn’t be allowed to use the road, and neither would the contractors, workers, or those companies allowed access for transportation of goods and services to the mine.

No Biological or Conservation Concerns?

The Department states that “*the proposed road route would cross the historical range of the Western Arctic Caribou herd (WAH)*” – which is currently in significant decline – but makes no mention at all of how this road may potentially affect the WAH, other than to say that any effects on animal movements can be mitigated by reducing traffic and activity at certain times in certain places.

The Delong Mountains Transportation System road (DTMS), at 51 miles in length, is a much shorter private industrial road than the proposed Ambler Road that services the Red Dog mine in Unit 23. The Department’s own biologists have done studies on the effects of the DMTS on WAH migrations, yet there is no mention at all of this in the Department comments. At minimum, we would have expected more information on how this proposed road may influence WAH migration patterns.

Intersection of Waterways & the Proposed Road

The proposed road would cross many rivers that both locals and non-locals currently utilize for hunting and trapping. The Department addresses this “intersection of navigable waters and the corridor and permitted activities on the waterways” as an issue brought up by the public that may have to be addressed via future regulatory action. But the Department has already decided on what they want to happen with the intersection of these waterways with the proposed road: **they want hunting and trapping prohibited along these waterways within one mile either side of the road**. We don’t understand why the Department wants to shut down future hunting opportunities along these waterways.

Memorandum of Understanding Between the Parties

We have reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the state, federal agencies, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Native corporation landowners, the Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority (AIDEA), and Ambler Metals LLC.

- It also calls for a no-fishing corridor that would be under the purview of the Board of Fisheries, but we have not seen any proposal to that board.
- There is nothing in the MOU that speaks to any corridor closure along any future spur roads that will likely be developed to support local communities.
- There is also nothing in the MOU that speaks to a similar proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board to institute a corridor closure on federal lands for federally qualified subsistence hunters.

The board should address these issues.

Conclusion

This proposal is too far-reaching for a road that is yet to be funded and built and is very much an example of putting the cart before the horse. We recommend that the board vote this proposal down or take no action on it at this time. It just isn't necessary to impose a no hunting and trapping corridor closure for the public along an as-yet-to-be-built **private** industrial road. We've never had to do this on any other private industrial road before they could be built.

We want to be clear that our opposition to this proposal in no way means we are opposing development of the Ambler mining district and a road to access it. What we oppose is the closing of hunting and trapping in over 400 square miles of country where it is currently allowed, absent any known conservation or biological concerns.

Another concern we have is that the Department anticipates other issues to come up if this road is built and says in their comments that *"additional regulatory needs will be addressed through regularly scheduled board cycles, and other avenues when warranted."* We also expect other issues to come up if the road is built resulting in a slew of Agenda Change Requests (ACRs) to the board. It would seem better – should this proposal pass – to allow out-of-cycle proposals to come in just for these areas within Units 23 and 24 associated with the road.

Proposal 1 – 5 AAC 92.126 (b) Non-Intensive Management Predator Control Plans, Unit 26(B) Musk Oxen Recovery Area.

SUPPORT

RHAK supports efforts to curb grizzly bear predation on muskoxen on the north slope.

Proposals 2 & 3 – 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of taking big game; exceptions. Allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electronic scopes in hunts for big game restricted to archery only.

SUPPORT

Clarifiers are currently legal in most states and do not give any advantage to bowhunters. They allow archers with poor near-vision to better see the sight pins. Non-electronic scopes provide a clearer magnified view to assist archers with poor vision.



PC103

Name: Tyler Riley

Community of Residence: Maryland

Comment:

Leave archery hunting as is!



PC104

Name: Ronald Roberts

Community of Residence: Kentucky

Comment:

I am against proposals, two and three ... let's keep technology off bows. Thank you for your time.



PC105

Name: Don Roepke

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

I submit this as a member of Comptons Traditional Bowhunters, and though not an Alaska resident, I have hunted in Alaska for several species. I copied what follows from our group since it states what I believe is the right path for the future of archery hunting. What manufacturers market to us as beneficial lies on a slippery slope...soon what is called an "archery hunt", implying challenging, becomes just another long range shooting experience. And after that, you or someone down the line will question why we need an archery hunt at all. Please don't let that happen, or at least please don't let the slide down the slippery slope begin. Archery is about close...not far.

What follows will appear in other's comments, but I will copy it anyway in support of others who are also making their thoughts known to you:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."

**PC106****Name:** John Romans III**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin**Comment:**

“I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska’s normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.” Keep the sportsmanship associated with outdoor skills in archery.

**PC107****Name:** Tara Russo**Community of Residence:** Haines**Comment:**

Take no action on Proposal 4.

Proposal 4 is premature because the Ambler Road has not been built and key route, access, litigation, and management questions remain unresolved.

The proposed road would already be private, gated, and closed to public travel, so a broad hunting and trapping closure is unnecessary at this stage.

The proposal does not address the real risks of the Ambler Road to fish, wildlife, habitat, wetlands, rivers, subsistence resources, and affected communities.

Any future management decisions must be shaped through meaningful consultation with affected Tribes, rural communities, local users, and people with long-standing relationships to the lands and waters along the corridor.

**PC108****Name:** Jim Sackett**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks**Comment:**

Oppose #4 as it not only violates our state constitution, but it's unnecessary. All public lands, state and federal, should be open to hunting. The BOG mission should be to increase hunting opportunities and not be considering regulations that decrease opportunities or make hunting more difficult.

**PC109****Name:** Philip Schlaegel III**Community of Residence:** Johnstown, Ohio**Comment:**

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Thank You,

Phil Schlaegel

**PC110****Name:** Cy Sneed**Community of Residence:** Soldotna**Comment:**

I do not approve of changes to the proposed changes around our current archery regulations. Archery is primitive by definition. I understand some hunters with poor eyesight might like these changes but they go too far in my opinion. If we were only discussing clarifiers and verifiers I would be in favor but electronics and scopes go against the foundation of archery hunting.



PC111

Name: Jay Spongberg

Community of Residence: Wawayanda

Comment:

oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."



PC112

Name: Rick Steiner

Community of Residence: Anchorage

Comment:

I oppose Proposal 1 (proposed predator control on North Slope). Unless and until the State of Alaska submits its IM programs to independent scientific review and/or a National Academies of Sciences review, it should not proceed with any IM program. I also oppose proposals 2 and 3. For proposal 4, the no-hunting buffer should be at least 10 miles from the Ambler road, not the 1 mile proposed.



PC113

Name: Dylan Steinmetz

Community of Residence: North Carolina

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation.

Thank You.

**PC114****Name:** Tim Stocklin**Community of Residence:** Philadelphia**Comment:**

"I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation." "Fair chase" is the whole principle behind our seasons, The introduction of high Tech electronic devices diminishes the purity of our sport, and opens the door to abuses which people are known to do.

**PC115****Name:** Trad bow hunters of alaska**Community of Residence:** Butler Ohio**Comment:**

I'm opposed to proposition 2 and 3, strongly oppose the use of electronic sights on archery equipment. The use of these devices takes away from the extended seasons set aside for true archery hunters. Kill rates are increased, in turn limiting the opportunities for Traditional hunters. Example is Ohio fall turkey season was eliminated for archery hunters due to increased kill rates due to technological advances in hunting equipment (crossbows). Please consider this carefully. These archery only seasons we fought for by and for true archery hunters, let's keep it that way.

**PC116****Name:** Kneeland Taylor**Community of Residence:** Anchorage**Comment:**

Proposal 1. Oppose. This proposal would provide for what is described as a non-intensive management predator control plan in Unit 26B. The program which is proposed is flawed because the eight year duration is too long, and because the harvest objective for Musk Ox too high. Indeed, no hunting for Musk Ox should be allowed, that is other than by federally qualified subsistence users.

Proposal 2. Support. This proposal would allow the use of verifiers, clarifiers, and non-electric scopes for big game archery hunts. This equipment purportedly is already legal for archery hunters who participate in rifle hunts.

Proposal 3. No comment. This proposal appears to be the same as Proposal 2,

Proposal 4. Support. This proposal would create a one mile buffer on both sides of the proposed Ambler Road. The Ambler Road is supposed to be a private road, used only for access to mineral deposits near Ambler. But the 211 mile road will, at a practical matter, give hunters and trappers access by car, truck, motor cycle, e-bike, ATV, and snow machine; even if these hunters and trappers have no genuine interest in mining.. I favor conservation of the lands adjoining the Ambler Road in their current condition, which is essentially wild, undeveloped, and unspoiled. Creating a two mile corridor where hunting and trapping will be prohibited will help conserve these lands and the wildlife that inhabits them. Thank you Department for this proposal.



PC117

Name: Don Thomas

Community of Residence: Lewistown, Montana

Comment:

As a former Alaska resident bowhunter and past Board member of the Alaska Bowhunters Association, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal Two and Three. Expanding the use of modern technology in Alaska bow seasons would be contrary to the spirit, ethics, and traditions of bowhunting that have evolved over the last hundred years.



PC118

Name: Donald Thompson

Community of Residence: Troy, Missouri

Comment:

“I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska’s normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation



Name: Craig Van Arsdale

Community of Residence: Soldotna

Comment:

I am writing to express my opposition to the Department bypassing the Democratic public process in which Proposals of this nature would be submitted in the normal regulatory cycle. Proposals 1-3 do not qualify as ACR's and were generated by the department and submitted out of cycle.

Members of the public DO NOT get this privilege and there is nothing about these proposals that warrants them special treatment.

This kind of behavior erodes the trust the public has in this process and in the Department. It appears to me like proposals 1-3 are Red Herrings as distractions to Proposal 4.

I am asking the Board to TAKE NO ACTION on Proposals 1-3 and defer these proposals to their appropriate meeting cycle to allow the normal public process to take place.

In the event that the Board considers these Proposals I ask that the following comments be considered.

Proposal 1- Oppose. This area has a quite restrictive bag limit and season structure compared to other Units for Brown Bear. I would like to see seasons and bag limits increases before these measures are implemented.

Proposal 2-Oppose. There are very few Archery Only opportunities in Alaska. The Department is ALWAYS NEUTRAL on methods and means EXCEPT in this ODD case where they are in support and authored this proposal out of cycle but still claim to be neutral... The Board of Game has been historically non supportive of Archery Only hunts arguing that there is plenty of opportunity without a weapons restricted hunt structure.

So using that same logic why can't these archers that want to use this equipment as proposed hunt in all of the General Season hunts that dominate the regulations?

Allowing further technology on Archery Equipment undermines the entire point of Primitive Weapons restricted hunts and the future of Archery Hunting only hunts being adopted.

It's also worth noting that the Pope & Young Club does not allow this type of technology in its Fair Chase Affidavit when allowing animals harvested to be entered into their record books.

Proposal 3-Oppose. There are very few Archery Only opportunities in Alaska. The Department is ALWAYS NEUTRAL on methods and means EXCEPT in this ODD case where they are in support and authored this proposal out of cycle but still claim to be neutral... The Board of Game

has been historically non supportive of Archery Only hunts arguing that there is plenty of opportunity without a weapons restricted hunt structure.

So using that same logic why can't these archers that want to use this equipment as proposed hunt in all of the General Season hunts that dominate the regulations?

Allowing further technology on Archery Equipment undermines the entire point of Primitive Weapons restricted hunts and the future of Archery Hunting only hunts being adopted.

Additionally an electronic bow sight that ranges the target at full draw and adjusts a pin on the fly for that yardage as the animal moves on the landscape is a massive technological advancement that has no business in Primitive Weapons hunts and will drastically increase harvest and therefore remove future opportunities for Archery Only hunts.

It's also worth noting that the Pope & Young Club does not allow this type of technology in its Fair Chase Affidavit when allowing animals harvested to be entered into their record books.

Proposal 4- Oppose. The fact that this is a road that will be built on Public Land but will be Private and closed to the public indefinitely is unacceptable. Closing the area of the proposed road for the construction process would be understandable but this proposal is egregious.

Furthermore as an alternative to fully closing the road I would suggest adopting the same regulations as the Dalton Highway where a 5 mile corridor on each side of the road be restricted to Bowhunting Only.



PC120

Name: Clay Vernon

Community of Residence: Home

Comment:

Hey there!

I oppose Proposal 4 because it would restrict hunting and trapping opportunity before there is a demonstrated need.

Hunting closures should be based on biological data or documented public safety concerns—not on speculative future development.

The Board of Game should preserve public hunting opportunity unless and until a management need is clearly established.

Approving closures before infrastructure exists sets a concerning precedent for future industrial projects across Alaska.

If operational safety concerns arise in the future, the Board can evaluate targeted, site-specific restrictions based on real-world conditions rather than hypothetical scenarios.

The areas of concern are beautiful, pristine, landscapes special to Alaska. We are one of the few states still doing things right and retaining untouched wilderness for the purpose of recreation and for knowing it's simply there.

Let's put the peoples voices first. Do what's right.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comment. Appreciate all that ADFG does a a whole!



PC121

Name: Michael Vigueria

Community of Residence: Colorado

Comment:

I completely oppose the changes to the archery regulations regarding scopes or other devices intended for the purpose of attaching to legal bows for hunting big game in the state of Alaska. The bowhunters of Alaska are not looking to make it "easy" as far as hunting for big game, so please, do not make any current changes to the regulations regarding the use of a bow and arrow in the pursuit of big game. Thank you, Mike Vigueria, Colorado, USA



PC122

Name: Gerald Wansack

Community of Residence: Petersburg, Ohio

Comment:

I oppose proposals 2 and 3

**PC123**

Name: Dave Weaver, The Alaskan Bowhunters Association

Community of Residence: Kentucky

Comment:

Greetings,

I strongly oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation. I strongly believe in keeping the restricted archery season as it is. I appreciate your time and for taking my concerns into consideration before making a decision on the two proposals.

Best regards,

Dave Weaver

**PC124**

Name: Gene Wensel

Community of Residence: Hamilton, Montana

Comment:

I guess I don't quite understand how and why crossbows are considered "primitive weapons" in Alaskan archery seasons now. Cocked, locked and loaded, released by a set trigger, bearing scopes with crosshairs, thumbhole stocks and bipods, a "crossbow" is NOT a real bow and doesn't belong in an archery-only season set aside for real bows. I might add that crossbow "arrows" (bolts) are too light in weight for energy retention and penetration at the 100+ yard ranges many people are shooting moose and caribou from on the tundra. I'm just sayin'....



PC125

Name: Patrick White

Community of Residence: Indiana

Comment:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to take no action on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."



PC126

Name: David Wildenstein

Community of Residence: Wellington FL

Comment:

I support proposal 2 and 3 as I believe that anything that increases opportunities for more people to participate in archery hunts is a good thing.



PC127

Name: Rick Wildermuth

Community of Residence: Arizona

Comment:

I think proposals 2 and 3 should not become law. These proposals will increase the use of unnecessary equipment, increase the numbers of game taken, which would reduce the number of tags sold.



PC128

Name: Russell Wilkins

Community of Residence: Runnells

Comment:

I am opposed to numbers 2 and 3 of the archery proposed regulations. By definition it would NOT be traditional hunting. You would be defeating the original intent. Why is this even being brought up?

**PC129****Name:** Ray Woodruff**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania**Comment:**

Be responsible, STOP technology from archery in Alaska

**PC130****Name:** Jerry Yarrington**Community of Residence:** Anchorage**Comment:**

Sir/ma'am, I respectfully submit the following for consideration:

1) Reduction of brown bears by "agents of the state" vs hunters. Please consider utilizing hunters to reduce your predators. We pay for tags, enjoy hunting, and it costs the taxpayer nothing. Consider permitting firearms within the DHMCA for brown bear harvest by hunters and/or extend the season. The grizzly season normally opens 10 Aug and I've never had the opportunity to pursue bears after 10 Aug just due to bad luck (I've spotted bears that were huntable prior to 10 Aug during my 7 or 8 trips up the Haul Road but not on/after). Bottom line, don't take hunt opportunities away from citizens and pay for staff to do what we'll do for free and as recreation.

4) Proposal 4 (Ambler Road access). In the proposal, you state that the Ambler road is/will be private with locked gate/24-hour staff. Recommend allowing Alaskans to access roads that transit public land that we own. Check our credentials if necessary but allow us to travel the road and have a corridor similar to the Dalton Highway Management Corridor. Why should this road be different from any other road on public land?

Administrative only (maybe?). The link for proposal 2 and 3 online read like the exact same thing (both talk about scopes, etc for archery). What is actually supposed to be posted here?



PC131

Name: Rodney York

Community of Residence: Madera County, California

Comment:

OPPOSITION:

I oppose Proposals 2 and 3 and urge the Alaska Board of Game to TAKE NO ACTION on either proposal during the special meeting. Furthermore, I encourage the Board to consider any future changes to archery equipment regulations only through Alaska's normal regulatory process, where they can receive full public review and stakeholder participation."

As a California resident who has hunted Alaska several times, I recognize and accept the challenge of hunting with a restricted archery hunting license/and or tag. It is MY RESPONSIBILITY to get close enough to ensure an ethical and lethal shot. "Hunters" not assuming this responsibility should not choose to hunt in a restricted hunt. Choose to hunt with a rifle. Become proficient with it and know your limits / then adhere to your personal limits. If you have disabilities/ challenges attain a doctors authorization for special hunts designed for your medical needs.

R York / 75 years of age

and still pursuing game with stick bows.



PC132

Name: Todd Zeuske

Community of Residence: Wisconsin

Comment:

I ask that you do not take action on proposals 2 and 3. I will be an archery hunt in AK this September.
