

DRAFT
2/25/85
#4964W

ALTERNATE NO. 1

AS 27.10.075 Extralateral Rights. The State of Alaska hereby confirms and grants to the owners of federal lode mining claims located prior to January 3, 1959, extralateral rights under shorelands, tidelands, and submerged lands as the terms are defined in AS 38.05.965.

S B

2 4 1 1

*
* DELIVER TO: JFOM *
*
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 03/26/85 TIME: 10:41 *
* FROM: MARTIE ROZKYDAL *
* SUBJECT: FOM - MATR-0132 *
* PRINT DATE: 03/26/85 TIME: 10:41 *
*

TO: SENATORS STURGULEWSKI, FAHRENKAMP, COGHILL, ELIASON, V. FISCHER, HALFORD-AND ZHAROFF

FROM: WYVON WRIGHT
BOX 3
PALMER 99645
745-3655

RE: SB 241, PREDATOR CONTROL

THIS IS A PROTEST TO SENATOR COGHILL'S BOUNTY BILL. I AM OPPOSED TO A BOUNTY OR ANY STATE MONEY BEING USED IN ANY WAY FOR ANY KIND OF TRAINING FOR KILLING WOLVES. PLEASE SUPPORT SB 62 IN SEN. VIC FISCHER'S ORIGINAL BILL.

SB 241

Most hearing speakers against aerial wolf hunts

By PETER PORCO
Daily News reporter

Aerial wolf hunting in Alaska was attacked as "ludicrous" and a "black eye" for Alaska, and defended as an efficient way to regulate Interior moose and caribou populations during a state Board of Game public hearing Friday.

A small parade of witnesses at the Hotel Captain Cook calmly and earnestly voiced their opinions on a series of proposed regulations put before the board; most speakers opposed the state's aerial wolf-hunting program.

The proposals cover several wolf-control programs in a handful of Interior game management units and ways to implement them, including aerial gunning and the use of radio collars.

Aerial shooting of wolves in Alaska by the state Department of Fish and Game was discontinued in February after a ruling by the Federal Communications Commission that the use of radio collars to track wolves in order to kill them violated provisions of the ADF&G permit.

The new proposals, in effect, have put the entire Alaska wolf-control program on the table for reconsideration by the Board of Game. The Game Division of ADF&G has advised the board on several methods of controlling wolf populations besides aerial gunning, including improving moose habitat, relocation of wolves, sterilization, poison, public shooting, trapper incentives, and others.

Alan Gaddie of Anchorage told the board he opposes gunning of wolves from planes.

"I have no close association with any political groups," Gaddie told the board. "I have no vested interest. I try to read every side. I don't want to be tagged as a knee-jerk, been-here-only-one-year urban greenie."

"I'm a schoolteacher and I have three businesses."

"I love Alaska and I'm going to be here until I die. But I'm real concerned about aerial wolf hunting. I'm against wolf control."

Board member Joel Bennett of Juneau, saw a distinction in Gaddie's comments between the issue of predator control in general and aerial gunning of wolves.

"Is that your genuine feeling?" Bennett asked Gaddie. "Is (the aerial program) something that doesn't sit right?"

"It doesn't sit right," Gaddie answered. "I'm not emotional, but it doesn't seem to make sense on what the policy is doing to Alaska's image around the world."

One of the few witnesses who favored the state's wolf control policies was Tom Scarborough, a consulting engineer and the chairman of the Fairbanks advisory committee.

Scarborough said his committee opposed most of the wolf proposals simply because, "We want to stay with the status quo (aerial hunting)."

Scarborough said he's testified for the

last 15 years in favor of wolf control "because there are certain populations in the state with one moose for every 10 square miles — the Tok area, for instance."

Scarborough has been a hunter since he was a child, he said. "My kids were raised on moose."

He stressed, however, that he's "not a hunter of horns. The guides would call me a meat hunter. You'll find most resident hunters are in my situation. You'll find a moose is worth a lot of money (in meat value)."

Scarborough said aerial trapping of wolves has worked in certain portions of game unit 20A and showed up through increased caribou and moose populations.

"The surviving calf rates in the spring rose dramatically from about 15 to 60 percent," he said, during the years the program was in effect, from the late 1970s to the early 1980s.

"You see immediate results. The other result you'll see is a growing wolf population" because larger herds of moose and caribou can support more wolves.

By contrast to 20A, Scarborough said, the moose population in unit 20E, where no aerial hunting was applied, is "extremely depressed. There shouldn't even be a (hunting) season."

The board will continue to hear public testimony today starting 9 a.m. in the Endeavor Room.

Times 3-23-85

Petition challenges wolf hunts

by Christopher Jarvis
Times Writer

The state is violating a 1983 court ban on aerial wolf kills by disguising it with legal "land-and-shoot" trapping, an attorney for the Alaska Wildlife Alliance said Friday.

In a lawsuit filed Friday in Anchorage Superior Court, attorney Edgar Paul Boyko asked to reopen a lawsuit from July. That lawsuit was dismissed when the state agreed to end the aerial wolf population control program until new regulations governing such programs could be developed.

The alliance, a wildlife preservation group, and some traditional wolf hunters also are seeking a

Petition opposes wolf hunt

— page A-8

temporary restraining order to prevent further aerial trapping — also known as "land-and-shoot" wolf hunting.

The lawsuit claims that "by indirection, evasion and through perceived legal loopholes," the state has subverted and defeated the intent of the December 1983 court order to stop aerial wolf population control until regulations are adopted. The Board of Game approved regulations for areas near Fairbanks in April but a general moratorium on the state program was ordered in February.

The Wildlife Alliance lawsuit says the state is permitting the wolf population to be severely reduced by allowing private hunters to spot wolves from the air, land and then kill them.

The state's aerial wolf hunts ended in late December when the Federal Communications Commission ruled the use of radio collars to track wolves for population control was illegal. But the

See Aerial, page A-8



A wolf pack feeds on a moose in the Denali National Park region in the shadow of wildlife scientist Gordon Haber's observation airplane. Haber says Interior wolf packs have learned to flee in panic at the approach of low-flying planes, which often carry aerial hunters. The wolves shown above are in a protected region.

c. 1985, Gordon Haber

3-23-85

Aerial wolf trapping hearing

Continued from page A-1

hunts continue, the alliance claims, because the population control programs are "euphemistically called aerial trapping or land-and-shoot hunting," which is legal.

Game Director Lew Pamplin of the Department of Fish and Game said that while the charges sound serious, the allegations probably have little merit. Pamplin said he has not yet had an opportunity to review the lawsuit.

A public hearing on aerial hunting for wolf population management began Friday and continues today. Environmental groups say they will demonstrate against resumption of aerial hunting this morning outside the Hotel Captain Cook, where the board is meeting.

Hunters "haven't broken any law," Pamplin said, noting that aerial trapping has been allowed

under state law for years.

"It's not something we just dreamed up," to control wolf populations, he said. "Land and shoot wouldn't accomplish (population) control anyway."

The lawsuit asks that hunters pay the state the value of wolf pelts taken by aerial trapping. It also asks trapping be done only with conventional traps or snares and that automatic or semi-automatic firearms in either hunting or trapping of wolves never be used again.

The state has been "encouraging private people to do the dirty work," Boyko said.

Wildlife scientist Gordon Haber called aerial trapping "double-speak."

According to the lawsuit, "the only issue is that of making the government bureaucrats . . . obey the laws which they are sworn and paid to enforce."

*
* DELIVER TO: JPOM *
* *
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 03/21/85 TIME: 10:58 *
* FROM: LIODJT *
* SUBJECT: FOMS *
* PRINT DATE: 03/21/85 TIME: 10:59 *
*

DELTA FOMS

FROM: TOM DOWLING, 2465 MILLTAN ROAD, DELTA JUNCTION, ALASKA 99737
TO: SEN. V. FISCHER, HALFORD, STURGULEWSKI, FAHRENKAMP, ZHAROFF
RE: SB 241

I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO SEN. COGHILL'S SB 241. THE REAL PROBLEM IS 500,000 PEOPLE PUTTING PRESSURE ON MOOSE AND CARIBOU, NOT THE WOLVES TRYING TO SURVIVE. LAY OFF THE WOLVES.

*
* DELIVER TO: JPOM *
*
* ORIGINAL *
* SENT: 03/21/85 TIME: 10:58 *
* FROM: LIOA *
* SUBJECT: BOM *
* PRINT DATE: 03/21/85 TIME: 10:58 *
*

21

TO: ALL SENATORS

FROM: MARILYN HOUSER
2411 INGRA
ANCHORAGE, AK. 99508
PHONE 278-2122 HM 274-6524 WK

RE: SB 241-WOLF BOUNTIES

INSTITUTION OF BOUNTIES WILL CAUSE THE EXTRIPATION OF WOLVES IN ALASKA WHICH EVEN ADF AND G O. FOLLOWS. ADF AND G DOESN'T EVEN HAVE WOLF POPULATION DATA. PLEASE DON'T ALLOW SUCH ARCHAIC PRACTICES TO RETURN TO ALASKA. BOUNTY PROGRAMS ARE DIFFICULT TO MONITOR AND WILL BE COSTLY TO ALASKA'S TREASURY, PUBLIC IMAGE AND WILDLIFE.

Board studies wolf report

Times
3-22-85

by Mary Scarpinato
Times Writer

Aerial shooting and poisoning are apparently the most effective methods for controlling wolves and protecting moose populations from these predators.

Sterilization of wolves is another method that deserves study.

A bounty system, such as the recent legislative proposal for a \$250 payment per wolf kill, would probably have little success.

These are among report findings on possible alternatives to aerial wolf hunting. The report was to be presented here today at a meeting of the Alaska Board of Game.

The board is expected to decide next week whether to allow resumption of the aerial hunts — a highly controversial topic for environmentalists, hunters and wildlife managers.

A public hearing on the issue also is scheduled to begin today and will resume at 9 a.m. Saturday.

The board called a moratorium on aerial hunts in December, when the Federal Communications Commission halted the use of radio collars to track the wolves to kill. Animal protectionists complained that the broadcast license for such collars is restricted to research projects.

In its considerations, the board must also determine if aerial hunts can be effective without the use of radio collars. The animals are collared by

See Wolf, page B-3

Wolf report tells alternatives

Continued from page B-1

game officials for a variety of purposes.

The report on alternatives to aerial hunting was prepared at the board's request by the Game Division of the state Department of Fish and Game.

It included these findings:

- Aerial hunting results in the past have varied "but generally the level of wolf harvests increased . . . Departmental costs to administer such a program are relatively low.

"A disadvantage, similar to bounties, is there is little field monitoring of actual take by the public, thus there is a potential for abuse whereby wolves could be taken from locations other

than the specified control areas."

- Poisons can be very effective, but they also can kill or harm other species.

- Female animal sterilization is a research project being considered by the department. But this would be dependent on available funding and staffing for such a project. Also, three to five years would be needed to compile sufficient data on its success potential.

- Bounty programs have not proven very effective in increasing the level of predator harvests. Another option of hiring expert trappers or training and assisting local trappers would be costly.

- Capturing and relocating wolves would be a complicated and costly alternative, and not

very promising within the state as most suitable habitats here already are supporting acceptable wolf population levels.

The state has a standing offer to send wolves to other states (the animals are endangered in all states but Alaska) if the other states or some organization would pay the expense. To date, no state has accepted the offer.

- Hunting seasons and bag limits on moose already are reasonably restrictive, and on wolves they are now considered liberal. Further changes would not have any significant impact.

The report discounted the practicality of attempting to enhance moose habitats in this state.

Enhancement is typically accomplished by increasing a species' feed supply, which for moose is mainly tender vegetation.

Tractor plowing and selective cutting could be used among the more mature tree stands to allow newer growth for feeding, but this can be expensive. Prescribed burns could be used, but these may have control problems.

"In much of Interior Alaska, habitat quality or quantity are not factors currently limiting moose populations," the report concluded. "There is presently more habitat available for moose than there are moose to utilize it."

Biologist submits anti-hunt petition

by Mary Scarpinato
Times Writer

Calling Alaska's wolves a "national treasure — not just a resource to be exploited by a few greedy individuals," a wildlife biologist presented the state Board of Game with a 14,000-signature petition against aerial wolf hunting.

Albert Manville handed the board the petition with signatures from across the United States and Canada, on behalf of the Defenders of Wildlife.

The state constitution "requires that resources be managed for all the citizens, not just a minority (of hunters and trappers)," he said.

Manville traveled from the organization's Washington, D.C. headquarters to testify Friday against resumption of aerial wolf hunts as part of the state's animal control program.

A general moratorium is in effect on the state's hunt method.

The public hearing continues today at the Hotel Captain Cook. The board is expected to rule on the matter later in the week.

Board Chairman Brenda Johnson listened to Manville's testimony, then noted that many Alaskans in remote areas cannot afford costly food shipments and rely on healthy moose herds to hunt for their daily nutrition.

Wolves, a main predator of moose, are sometimes hunted by the state in an effort to protect moose populations.

"How can we sit here as a board and not do something to help other people who are also part of the universe?" Johnson asked Manville.

Manville responded that his organization recognized that "certain emergency situations" might exist. It is primarily con-

cerned with pressure for more predator control from recreational moose hunters, he said.

Manville's group "would not approve but it would not oppose" short-term control programs in emergency cases when subsistence hunters' food supply was at stake, he said.

However, Manville said the effectiveness of aerial hunting as a predator control is not supported by scientific argument.

Factors such as mild or harsh winters contribute to the balance of wolf populations, he said, and past experience with aerial hunts show the method provides only temporary management solutions.

Mike Lannigan, who spoke on behalf of the Copper Basin Sportsmen's Association, said he had no proposal of his own to offer on the issue. But he added that when control measures are

limited to emergency situations, "often it's too late and the damage is already done."

Lannigan said it was "ridiculous to attempt to control" game officials' wildlife management goals. "We pay them to manage our resources, so let's let them do it."

Cliff Eames, representing the Alaska Center for the Environment, said that his organization "favors a policy of maintaining a natural diversity" and not selecting the survival of one species over another.

Eames said the center also recognized that threat to subsistence hunters' survival at times may require emergency measures.

But to use aerial hunting as a method to do this, he said, "is clearly counter to the standards of fair chase we all say we believe in."

LACHER: Her style draws admirers, critics

Continued from Page B-1

the 1985 mayoral race. "She would tend to butt heads in a confrontational manner."

"She's aggressive," agreed Assemblyman John Musgrove, who also served with her. "Sometimes too much. She sure could cause an awful rumpus."

Lacher came to Alaska when she was 12, the product of a broken home. That situation is largely responsible for her attitudes about a strong family and establishing roots, she says, and is one she can't discuss to this day without her voice cracking. She attended local schools, at 17 married her high school sweetheart, Bob Lacher, and started raising children.

Since then she has owned a beauty shop — Bessie's Beauty Bar — a motorcycle parts store, driven a school bus and currently is the co-owner and manager of Alaska First Title Insurance Agency.

"She's a modern-day phenomenon," Alford said.

Lacher's political evolution was undramatic. Her family

never talked politics and she never envisioned she'd be involved. Her early influences were bi-partisan, and she says Barry Goldwater, Lyndon Johnson and John Kennedy all sparked her equally. But beliefs "most Americans felt strongly about" generally held sway and she found herself more often aligned with the Republican Party.

She ran successfully for the borough assembly in 1981 after watching what she says was an arrogant indifference to constituents from members of that body. The realization that "things needed to be said" prompted her run for the House the next year, a race she also won.

But her sights were set higher, and in 1984 she took on 22-year incumbent Kerttula. Today she talks about that campaign as a victory.

"The race against Kerttula was successful," she says. A "nobody" who came within 1,000 votes of someone as powerful as Kerttula after being outspent in the campaign cannot be described as a loser, she says. She has no

regrets.

The loss the next year to Jones, however, hurt. Running for borough mayor was a "terrible mistake," she says now, one that she made only because her supporters urged her to. Again, her voice cracks.

But even with two losses behind her, she is running again, becoming a perennial candidate. She's running not to fulfill an ambition or gain power, she says, but solely for altruistic reasons.

"You can do more public good as a senator than you can as a private individual," she says. "How can you not be involved when there's so many important issues?"

But such sentiments may not be enough.

"Our graveyards are filled with people who have thought they were indispensable to the public good," said Kay Bills, vice chairman of the Valley Democratic party.

"Already I've had people say to me they're not going to vote for her because she's been defeated twice," Jones said. "And those are far more

politically astute people than I am."

Democrats are delighted at the prospect of Lacher as an opponent, according to Bills.

"She's an ideal candidate," she said. "We were hoping she would come out. She's the best thing for organizing Democrats in the Valley."

Lacher is known for personal attacks, using innuendo and running a negative campaign, Bills said, factors that can only work to her opponents' advantage.

But Lacher is misperceived, her friends say, and there is a side to her the public never sees. The real Barbara, they say is the one who spends every Sunday with her family, who cares deeply about people, who is intensely loyal to the Valley, and who is a tremendous problem solver and astute businesswoman.

"She's a symbol for other women," Alford said. "I'm amazed at what she has done with her own life. Every year has been a giant step forward."

Timber, agriculture interests clash over Susitna forest use

By CHRIS GEIGER
Daily News reporter

3/2/86
WASILLA — Hoping to stimulate Alaska's fledgling timber industry, the governor's office and state Division of Forestry have proposed creating a half-million-acre state forest in the Susitna Valley.

The scattering of parcels involved stretches from Petersburg to Mount Susitna, from Skwentna to the upper Kashwitna River. A mixture of swampy meadows and forest stands, about one-third of the land holds commercial-grade timber.

The bill creating the state forest — originally introduced last spring — resurfaced Monday for hearings in the Senate Resources Committee. But if the hearing was any indication of things to come, the state forest issue may pit Alaska's fledgling agriculture and logging industries against each other in a competition for land.

The Alaska Farmers and Stockgrowers Association and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough's Agriculture and Forestry Advisory Committee opposed the bill at the hearing, decrying it as an unnecessary "lockup" of state lands.

State foresters, however, said the state needs to designate land for future timber production if loggers are to invest in long-term, large-scale timber harvests.

Under state forest designation, lands are managed on a "multiple use" basis. Multiple use management allows for grazing, mining, recreation, and wildlife and watershed preservation areas — but not agriculture.

It is the exclusion of agriculture that farmers oppose, according to Jerry Giaugue, president of the Alaska Farmers and Stockgrowers Association. The association's Southcentral chapter passed a resolution against the proposal at its meeting last week, he said.

Giaugue and others at the hearing cited passages in the state constitution that call for the state to encourage settlement of its land. Setting aside state forests contradicts this goal, they said.

"Loggers need to know there's going to be trees 50 years from now, but the people of Alaska need to know there's going to be agricultural land in 50 years, too," Giaugue said.

Most of the proposed state

forest was previously outlined in the Susitna Area Plan, a land-use plan for state holdings completed last June.

Proponents of the state forest argue that the plan already set aside the best land in the basin — about 26,000 acres — for agricultural disposals. Another 82,000 acres of prime land are reserved for future land disposals, and an additional 150,000 acres of remote areas are designated "resource management" areas, which could some day be used for agriculture.

Borough Forester Zane Cornett said the state forest is a "direct product of the Susitna Area Plan," which was three years in the making. If critics are going to make an issue out of something that's a product of the plan, he said, they might as well throw the whole plan out.

"I don't think anybody wants to start over again," Cornett said.

Delon Brown, a member of the agriculture and forestry committee, said only foresters believe creation of a state forest is necessary yet. The state should consider giving more land to private control

See Page B-3; **FOREST**