

From: Rebecca Schwanke [<mailto:becky99588@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2017 8:03 AM
To: Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Cc: Don and Joyce Horrell <trtp@cvinternet.net>; Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>;
Rep. George Rauscher <Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>
Subject: RE: HB40 comments from Don Horrell

Thank you for the response Mr. Josephson. I have passed your reply on to Mr. Horrell.

I hope you meant to type "isn't filled with anger"...

You should know that between Tok, the Copper Basin, and Valdez, virtually all the trap lines I'm aware of are voluntarily marked specifically for the benefit of other potential trail users including dog mushers, recreational riders, skiers, and new trappers. Please understand some are not marked for certain, often personal reasons.

As a former state biologist who worked closely with the Alaska State Troopers though, I can tell you it's easy to track down the name of virtually any trapper in our tight knit community if need be.

Additional restrictive trapping regulations in our rural-roadside area are unnecessary. Even when it comes to maintained trails here, there are very few conflict problems when it comes to trapping.

Respectfully,
Becky Schwanke
PO Box 612
Glennallen, AK 99588

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Sun, Feb 19, 2017 at 8:36 AM, Rep. Andy Josephson
<Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov> wrote:

Don:

I appreciate your writing. And, I appreciate that your email is filled with anger at the process or at the Legislature.

Your comment that your signage, notifying of a trapline, is voluntary, is very telling to me.

Thanks again,

Andy Josephson

From: Rebecca Schwanke [<mailto:becky99588@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:49 AM
To: Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>; Rep. George Rauscher <Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>; Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Mike Chenault <Rep.Mike.Chenault@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Tuck <Rep.Chris.Tuck@akleg.gov>; rep.delana.johnson@akleg.gov; rep.chris.burch@akleg.gov; Rep. Justin Parish <Rep.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>; Rep. Harriet Drummond <Rep.Harriet.Drummond@akleg.gov>; Rep. Dean Westlake <Rep.Dean.Westlake@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB40 comments from Don Horrell

Dear Alaska Representatives,

Please accept this comment on HB40 from Don Horrell, a local here in Tazlina who asked me to submit it for him.

Representative Josephson

Ref House Bill #40

I have been a trapper for over 40 years. I live in the Glennallen, Tazlina area, and having a thirty mile trap line leaving from my home in Tazlina I absolutely oppose this bill. I put in and maintained my trap line year after year and my trail is my trap line. Once the snow

animals, wolves, foxes, martin etc travel over your trap line which is your trail, to be a successful trapper you need traps along and within your trail. Because of where I live and work I always marked my trail with a sign stating this trail was a trap line. But please understand this was my choice to mark my trail as a trap line. As stated in other letters the Alaska Trappers Association and the Department of Fish and Game have worked on this issue for years trying to help non trappers understand the issues.

Don Horrell

PO Box 364

Glennallen, AK 99588

To: the Resource Committee

RE: HB 40

This is a very bad bill. This bill should not be the privy of the legislature. This is a function of the Board of Game. If someone wants to put this into place, they need to put a proposal to the Board, then it goes through the proper process. There is one major problem with a proposal like this or a bill like this. It is written for urban areas, not rural Alaska. Many trails in rural Alaska are only used by trappers. Alaskan main animal trappers are after is marten. Marten sets would not catch a dog or someones pet. They are mostly above ground and small traps & conibears. This would put an unnecessary burden on serious trappers to do a set 200 feet from a trail and drastically hinder their livelihoods. Some common sense needs to be exercised in these types of bills.

RE: HB 105

I am totally against this bill. First, the person it is named after was not well respected by most of Alaskans. The majority of Alaska are people of the hunting world with little respect for animal rights types. Second, the bill is not at all what Alaska should be doing with the less than 40% remaining state land after all the federal and private lands are accounted for. Alaska has a huge federal land mass just under 60%, and then the private and native lands. State land has enough special use areas. We need to manage well what land we have. This is just an effort to shut done more hunting areas that is not necessary.

Please consider my comments on these bills. Thank-you

Susan [Sue] Entsminger
HC 72 Box 800
Tok, AK 99780

Al Barrette
380 Peger Rd.
Fairbanks, AK. 99709
907-452-6047
HB 40 version J

15 Feb. 2017

Do not support.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Page 1. Lines 13 and 14 “establishing a fee”

- A. This would impact my subsistence uses and or opportunities.
- B. If this proposed legislation would pass, it would be the first time that in addition to a state required license that a fee would be mandatory for a subsistence user to have an opportunity to participate in any subsistence opportunity. I wonder if it is lawful to have an additional fee for subsistence opportunity.

Page 2 Line 8 no trapping within 200’ part (2) public trails developed or improved with public funds.

I would encourage you to look at DNR’s maps of recognized RS 2477 right of ways. (There is tens of thousands of miles of recognized trails) There was and is public funds used for the development of all these trails. This would impact subsistence users using these trails and would not comply with “economy of effort” of subsistence users. This term is found in 5 AAC 92.99.010 (3). The same application for trails identified in AS 41.21 that lay outside non-subsistence areas. Consideration should be made about how this will impact subsistence users. Thank you for allowing me to voice my concerns as a subsistence user.

Al Barrette

From: Patrick Frymark [<mailto:pcfrymark@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2017 12:38 PM

To: Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>; Rep. Dean Westlake <Rep.Dean.Westlake@akleg.gov>; Rep. Harriet Drummond <Rep.Harriet.Drummond@akleg.gov>; Rep. Justin Parish <Rep.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Birch <Rep.Chris.Birch@akleg.gov>; Rep. DeLena Johnson <Representative.DeLena.Johnson@akleg.gov>; Rep. George Rauscher <Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>; Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>; Rep. Mike Chenault <Rep.Mike.Chenault@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Tuck <Rep.Chris.Tuck@akleg.gov>

Cc: Rep. Scott Kawasaki <Rep.Scott.Kawasaki@akleg.gov>; Sen. Pete Kelly <Sen.Pete.Kelly@akleg.gov>

Subject: House Bill 40

Members of the House Resources Committee:

I write to you in opposition of House Bill 40, which would prohibit trapping within 200 feet of a public trail.

While I acknowledge that domestic animals should be safe from traps and snares, I believe a complete prohibition around a trail goes too far in curtailing the rights and livelihoods of trappers. A more suitable solution may be the requirement of clear, standardized markings and signs on trap lines that warn people about the presence of a line (and, by extension, to mind their local leash laws) and thus share the rights of responsible trapping and responsible animal ownership.

Additionally, I am concerned by the lack of definition for "public trail." In many cases, the task of cutting a trail falls on the trappers themselves. By claiming the labor of the trapper for the public good and then forcing the trapper off of the resulting trail you've created a burden that both discourages trapping and punishes those who already trap responsibly.

Further, I believe that the law creates an unintended consequence where a 200 foot setback would create a 200 foot long trail that would eventually be deemed a public trail and require an additional setback. This is an extension of the previously mentioned problem where trappers' trails are claimed for the public good and then closed to them, forcing them to cut new trails that would eventually be closed again.

As a dog owner myself, I would be devastated to find my pet in a trap. I am not unsympathetic to the concerns of pet owners, but I believe that responsible pet ownership requires me to adhere to local leash laws, to be familiar with the environment I am walking in and to respect the public activities that take place on our state lands.

Thank you for your consideration of my position.

-Pat Frymark
Fairbanks, AK

From: Jerry White [<mailto:jerrywhite99559@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 11:56 AM
To: Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 40

Dear Honorable Representative Josephson,

Thank you for your service. I appreciate the purpose of HB 40, but I have reservations about the larger impact a law like this may have in the future. As you know, new laws often open the door to more restriction, more regulation, and more degradation to the effectiveness of an activity. Just yesterday, President Trump rolled back one example of how one good idea opened the door for many harmful laws regarding coal production.

Tagging traps is unnecessary in our state. It would only add another level of bureaucracy and more cost to trapping.

Your 200 feet proposal is wildly excessive. Dogs and small children should not be unsupervised in public places for any reason. Alaskans are attacked by wildlife on public trails in Anchorage, so to suggest that dogs and small children should have the freedom to wander unsupervised is irresponsible.

As a Board of Game Advisory Council member, I see anti-trapping/hunting groups working to modify the definitions and laws all of the time. So, I can see your definition of affected trails, public sites, and etc. being expanded to include traditional mail routes, winter trails, and more. This law would not benefit all Alaskans. In fact, it would be harmful to the trapping community. I do not support this bill.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jerry White

From: Rebecca Schwanke [<mailto:becky99588@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:49 AM

To: Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>; Rep. George Rauscher <Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>; Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>

Cc: Rep. Mike Chenault <Rep.Mike.Chenault@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Tuck <Rep.Chris.Tuck@akleg.gov>; rep.delana.johnson@akleg.gov; rep.chris.burch@akleg.gov; Rep. Justin Parish <Rep.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>; Rep. Harriet Drummond <Rep.Harriet.Drummond@akleg.gov>; Rep. Dean Westlake <Rep.Dean.Westlake@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>

Subject: HB40 comments from Don Horrell

Dear Alaska Representatives,

Please accept this comment on HB40 from Don Horrell, a local here in Tazlina who asked me to submit it for him.

Representative Josephson

Ref House Bill #40

I have been a trapper for over 40 years. I live in the Glennallen, Tazlina area, and having a thirty mile trap line leaving from my home in Tazlina I absolutely oppose this bill. I put in and maintained my trap line year after year and my trail is my trap line. Once the snow animals, wolves, foxes, martin etc travel over your trap line which is your trail, to be a successful trapper you need traps along and within your trail. Because of were I live and work I always marked my trail with a sign stating this trail was a trap line. But please understand this was my choice to mark my trail as a trap line. As stated in other letters the Alaska Trappers Association and the Department of Fish and Game have worked on this issue for years trying to help non trappers understand the issues.

Don Horrell
PO Box 364
Glennallen, AK 99588

From: temple dillard [mailto:temple_dillard@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:42 PM

To: Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>; Rep. Dean Westlake <Rep.Dean.Westlake@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>; Rep. Harriet Drummond <Rep.Harriet.Drummond@akleg.gov>; Rep. Justin Parish <Rep.Justin.Parish@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Birch <Rep.Chris.Birch@akleg.gov>; Rep. DeLena Johnson <Representative.DeLena.Johnson@akleg.gov>; Rep. George Rauscher <Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>; Rep. David Talerico <Rep.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>; Rep. Mike Chenault <Rep.Mike.Chenault@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Tuck <Rep.Chris.Tuck@akleg.gov>

Subject: House Bills 40, 105

To Whom it May Concern

I am Temple Dillard, I testified February 15th reference House Bill 40. I also did try to squeeze in a few words about House Bill 105. I was out of turn at that time, for that I apologize. Had I better apprised myself of the agenda, I'd have tried to get in on both of them during their respective times.

Firstly, House Bill 40. I do not support this bill. Representative Josephson wishes to inflict this "solution" to his local problem upon the entire state. Trapping is already illegal in his district, as are the loose dogs that are being trapped. But apparently it's not expected that dog owners obey Title 17 in Anchorage, or the other borough leash laws on the road system, but if someone fed up with these loose dogs buys a trap and kills a nuisance dog then clearly we must penalize all the trappers across the over half a million square miles of the rest of the State in order to solve the issue of people ignoring the regulations and laws that are already in place.

Representative Josephson, I took great offense to your remark insinuating that since your bill is failing that everyone must believe "a dog was trapped, 'oh well.'" There is no "oh well" about it. I've owned dogs my whole life, and loved every one of them. I've also seen these dogs I love come back from the woods with quills in their faces and paws, and moose on their heels. And all of that was my own fault, I allowed the dog to be loose. I no longer allow my dogs to run loose, because I love them and their safety is my responsibility. I trap near Fairbanks, and take great pains to avoid catching loose dogs, and every year multiple times a season I am met by loose dogs in the parking area. They come running over to me, wanting to smell the goodness that emanates from most trappers. They come running to me, unleashed, despite their owner's fervent cries to "come" or "heel up." These dogs are clearly not in voice control. I love on these dogs because to their fortune they've all been friendly, but I will not hesitate to shoot any animal that is threatening my person or worse that of any of my family as I do take my 5 year old son trapping on warm days. Any mention of the leash law to the dogs' owners is met with a laugh or a sneer, "This is Alaska, I don't have to leash my dog." Your problem in your district Representative Josephson isn't the trapping in the rest of the State which you wish to cripple, it's the law breakers in your district that disregard already existing regulations against trapping in that area and Title 17 requiring dogs to be leashed.

Now, House Bill 105. I do not support this bill either. Mr. Dale, the Director of Wildlife Conservation, indicated that that wolves that reside in the park, though they may venture outside the line drawn by us humans, are "harvested at a very light level...harvest does not affect the

population size nor the population dynamics." Mr. Dale also indicated that although he didn't have the exact numbers with him at the time that the population density of the wolves east of the Park, where it is open to trapping, was twice as high as it is IN the park, where it is closed to trapping. The Park consists of nearly ten thousand square miles of land that is closed to trapping. But east of the park, which is open to trapping and does have many successful wolf hunters working in that area both from the Parks Highway and from the Richardson Highway, has double the wolf population of the closed area. Clearly, there is something else going on inside the closure that is affecting the wolf population, and you want to subject more land to that closure? If closing land to trapping would boost wolf population, why is it that land utilized by successful wolf trappers has double the density of the closed area? Wolf populations, even in heavily trapped areas, are high, so high in some areas that aerial wolf control is currently being utilized to cull the population in defense of ungulate populations.

Temple Dillard
Alaska Native Trapper and Skin Sewer
Resident since birth in 1987
Voter

