

12276

HOUSE RES

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Jessica Bush [ak\_gypsy77@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 27, 2008 2:22 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Oppose HB 256!

Jan 27, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

I am a born and raised Alaskan. I feel I have more of a right to speak on this than an out of state force that really has no concern of this state, the people or the life within it. I was raised to cherish and respect all life and the law of nature. Which I have come to see, our government has forgotten all about. Instead I see the people with the power of our state, our country become more concerned about money and

power. 5,000 species a year get extinct from this type of ignorance of our leaders.

I among the thousands of Alaskan do not support the aerial shooting law that you are so ignorance trying to pass in order to gain more money.

The true fact is since the human population is growing, we are taking up more space for the rest of nature. This is why more and more wildlife is being forced in the human areas of everyday living.

Hunters are killing wildlife for sport, leaving Wolves, bears, predators as they are labeled to leave their territories and prey on

household pets, because they have no other way to survive. Because you allow this activity of hunting to continue. I feel more and more the government so blindly doing what they are.

Are destroying the world that we are living in. Soon there will be no longer any wildlife here. Also global warming. You have no idea what impact and damage you really are doing.

If this continues I feel you will loss the support of your people.

People are already losing their faith in their leaders. Even more so now. Without people, you have nothing. No money, no power.

I am against aerial shootings, trapping or killing predators at all. I am also against you going into a bear or wolf den to hunt.

I know I am not the only one.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Miss Jessica Bush

4228 Chess Dr  
Anchorage, AK 99508-5631

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Paula Beneke [pbeneke@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 27, 2008 3:22 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Oppose HB 256!

Jan 27, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Ms. Paula Beneke  
2101 W 29th Ave Unit 11  
Anchorage, AK 99517-1909

## Terry Harvey

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Kendell Macomber [kendell\_kids@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2008 1:54 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Oppose HB 256!

Jan 28, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

I am disappointed in your lack of listening to the people of Alaska!  
As a fellow Alaskan I would expect you to respect our land and its

animals. Please make the choice that you know will get the support of us Alaskans. Stop the aerial hunt!!

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kendell Macomber  
PO Box 83484  
Fairbanks, AK 99708-3484

## Jeanne Ostnes

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Jennifer McCard [j\_mccard@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 27, 2008 9:53 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Please Oppose HB 256!

Jan 28, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

HB 256 would...

- \* Make a bad law worse. HB 256 would make our "intensive management" law worse by renaming it "active management" and giving the Board of Game a completely free hand to control predators -- the Board would merely need to think that airborne or same-day airborne shooting would be "conducive" to meeting a prey objective.
- \* Expand Alaska's already excessive, expensive, and often ineffective predator control programs and pave the way for the Board of Game to increase this unnecessary killing by leaving all decisions

about using planes to manage Alaska's wildlife up to the Board of Game without requiring scientific data or an analysis by Fish and Game biologists.

- \* Gut the intention of the voter-enacted ban on the same-day airborne shooting of wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines and make it much easier to increase the aerial killing of these animals.
  - \* Allow for the aerial gunning of carnivores to reduce predator populations in order to artificially and unsustainably boost game populations -- a practice that will primarily benefit urban and out-of-state hunters, not rural hunters with demonstrated needs.
  - \* Add brown bears and wolverines to the list of species that may be shot by state-licensed aerial gunners.
  - \* Permit the use of airplanes to track and shoot down wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines without requiring a comprehensive "game management plan" to be in place beforehand.
- Therefore, please oppose HB256.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Miss Jennifer McCard  
320 Banner Ln  
Soldotna, AK 99669-7423

**Debra Higgins**

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Tara Walker [walk@alaska.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2008 6:54 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Oppose HB 256!

Jan 28, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

Don't add brown bears to the list of our shameful policy of aerial gunning as this expensive, inefficient, and unscientifically based

program has made us the butt of nationwide outcry, and marginalized in the scientific community. What are you thinking! This will make an atrocious bill worse. Why are the rights of urban and wealthy out of state hunters worth the state money to exterminate our natural predators? Our wilderness and animals are our treasures, and we must

protect them, or if you continue to ignore your mandate to do that, at least don't block out the input of scientific data in making predator plans. Why should hunters be guaranteed a moose? As a life long Alaskan, I say stop this bill.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Ms. Tara Walker  
6918 Gemini Dr  
Anchorage, AK 99504-4520

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** TBanks [TBanks@defenders.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2008 9:01 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Carl Gatto; Rep. Anna Fairclough; Rep. Bob Roses; Rep. Paul Seaton;  
Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Bryce Edgmon; Rep. David Guttenberg; Rep. Scott Kawasaki  
**Cc:** martyannette@gci.net  
**Subject:** Wildlife/predator control issue: HB 256

Subject: HB 256 hearing, January 30, 1:00 pm, Barnes 124, Alaska State Capitol

Dear House Resources Committee members:

I'm sure you've heard all the biologically sound reasons to oppose HB 256. No sense reiterating them here. Please keep in mind that the majority of Alaskans have twice now voted against same-day airborne shooting of wolves, grizzly bears, and wolverines. Additionally, there are some moral and ethical issues fused within this Bill that many people like myself find deeply troubling, that being: artificial game farming via State-sponsored predator genocide which does not foster healthy ecosystems, biodiversity, or true wilderness values. But it does underscore the mean-spirited, self-indulgent ME, ME, ME, it's all about ME attitude of the Bill's sponsors and supporters. I, therefore, urge you to do the right thing and oppose HB 256. Thank you.

Marty Cordano

*(Marty - please hit "Reply all" to supply your street address, and confirm that this email is from you, not me.)*

Anchorage, Alaska

MC:tb

**Terry Harvey**

---

**From:** Tania Lewis [lupineluna@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 8:15 AM

**To:** Rep. Carl Gatto; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Anna Fairclough; Rep. Bob Roses; Rep. Paul Seaton;  
Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Bryce Edgmon; Rep. David Guttenberg; Rep. Scott Kawasaki

**Subject:** HB 256

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to urge you to reject House Bill 256, a bill that would allow the governor and the Board of Game to decide the fate of predator/prey ecosystems across Alaska with no required input from scientists and research studies. I have never seen such a blatant attempt to manage resources for the benefit of a select group of people, with no regard for natural processes and science. Predator control is a highly controversial issue in this state, and most of those who support it want to know that the situation has been scientifically assessed and determined that 1) there is a need for predator control, and 2) that no long term harm will be done to the land and the animals that we all love so dearly. Without scientific studies, it is not possible to determine either of these to be true. Without requiring science, we would make the animals and ecosystems of this state subject to the whim of the political administration with no information on what is really going on in these remote portions of the state.

I am a wildlife biologist and resource manager in Alaska. I have been trained to collect and analyze data objectively, and come to conclusions based on the facts, not my personal preferences. This objectivity is what makes science so essential in making management decisions, and I cannot imagine making a decision that may have severe impacts on a wildlife population without first consulting results from a scientific study. To do so would be like sticking my head in the sand and hoping for the best! Yes science can deter and/or delay development. This is because science looks at the big picture beyond the human realm, a picture we are all a part of whether we acknowledge it or not. It is essential that we understand natural ecosystems and processes before we attempt to alter them for our benefit. Any law that lessens this responsibility is a shallow and narrow minded attempt to advance our own agenda irregardless of the effects on our environment that supports us.

Again, I urge you to reject this attempt to override the scientific process with political agendas.

Sincerely,

Tania Lewis  
P.O. Box 251  
Gustavus AK  
99826  
907-723-4440

**Debra Higgins**

---

**From:** Joan Andersen [JAndersen@bankston.io]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 9:31 AM

**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson

**Subject:** HB 256

I strongly oppose HB 256. This new bill only worsens an already out-of-kilter ecosystem caused by the original aerial hunting statute. Passage of the new bill would further erode Alaska's ecosystems and the balance between prey and predators. It is completely unnecessary, and bottom line, it will prove harmful to the State of Alaska. Please do not pass HB 256. Thank you.

## HB 256 Ignores Alaskans' Views on Aerial Gunning and Further Weakens the Scientific Integrity of State Laws Regarding Wildlife Management



**Introduced in the final days of the 2007 legislative session and at Governor Palin's request,** House Bill (HB) 256 would further erode the state's Intensive Management law by eliminating the few remaining standards governing predator control. The current Intensive Management law is already being used to implement predator control programs on more than 56,000 square miles of the state. These programs allow for the aerial gunning of wolves and other liberalized hunting methods to reduce predator populations in order to artificially and unsustainably increase prey populations. Rather than correcting the mistakes made by Governor Murkowski and his administration, which ignored Alaskan voter sentiment regarding the use of airplanes to kill wolves and the management of Alaska's predators, Governor Palin's legislation would pave the way for the Board of Game to expand the control programs by removing scientific standards.

Governor Palin introduced this bill (and its identical Senate companion, SB 176) because of successful and pending litigation that have challenged the predator control programs. It attempts to thwart further legal challenges to the Board of Game's implementation of these laws. With the Governor's support, this bill is being heard beginning January 30, 2008 in the legislature. The bills are assigned to the Senate Resource, Judiciary and Finance Committees and to the House Resources and Judiciary Committees.

**The proposed legislation guts the intention of the voter-enacted bans on same-day airborne shooting of wolves:** Despite the public's approval of two ballot measures restricting same-day airborne shooting of wolves, Governor Palin's bill (HB 256) ignores the will of Alaskan voters. Not only does the bill add brown bears to the list of game species that may be hunted by aerial gunners licensed by the state to conduct predator control in certain areas, it also deletes the requirement that there be a game management program in place prior to enacting the extreme measure of using airplanes to track and shoot down wolves and bears. Palin's bill would leave all decisions about "predator

control" gunning with airplanes within the discretion of the Board of Game and removes significant reliance on scientific information.

### **The proposed legislation makes a bad law worse:**

The existing law has no scientific standards for predator control and is a bad system of wildlife management because it fails to represent all users and provide for the long-term conservation of all wildlife species and habitat. The proposed law would be significantly worse because it would eliminate the requirement that the Board of Game determine that "predation is an important cause for the failure to achieve" prey numbers and hunter success, and that "a reduction of predation can reasonably be expected to aid in the achievement of the objectives." Instead, the Board would merely need to conclude that airborne or same-day airborne shooting "would be conducive" to meeting one of its prey objectives or harvest levels. The requirement that Board of Game decisions be based on information from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would be eliminated.

### **The proposed legislation gives no recognition to the importance of healthy ecosystems:**

Like the existing legislation, the proposed bill fails to acknowledge the role carnivores play in keeping ecosystems healthy and would continue the unwise and excessive removal of predators across large areas of the state, totaling more than 56,000 square miles. This widespread, intense culling of predators results in long-term loss to ecosystem function and is costing the state at least a million dollars each year.

**In conclusion:** The solution to legal problems with the State's predator control reduction programs is not to liberalize the existing, already bad, intensive management law. Alaska needs wildlife management laws that promote science-based, effective, economically feasible wildlife planning that addresses the views of all user groups. Senate Bill 176 and House Bill 256 must not pass.

## TESTIMONY OF JOEL BENNETT

15255 Point Louisa Road  
Juneau, Alaska 99801  
907-789-1718

Co-sponsor and Initiative Committee Member, 2008 Initiative entitled  
05HUNT

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Joel Bennett. I'm a 39-year resident of Juneau, Alaska. I served on the Board of Game for over 12 years. I have been an active, licensed hunter for every year of my residency.

I have also been a organizer and sponsor of each of the airborne wolf hunting ballot measures that passed in 1996 and 2000, and am presently co-sponsoring a third ballot measure on the same subject that has been certified for a vote in the August 2008 primary election.

I have been involved with this issue, both on and off the Board of Game, for over 30 years.

Let me say at the outset, on behalf of our initiative group, Alaskans for Wildlife, that we do not oppose predator control. In fact we support it and we believe the general public does too----but only where predators are causing a demonstrated biological emergency, and when carried out by Department of Fish and Game personnel. We also believe that programs must be based on adequate scientific data and only remove the minimum number of animals necessary to address the problem.

These are the main principles of all three initiatives. They are principles that we believe create standards that can be supported by most Alaskans, as evidenced by repeated ballot measure passage.

Unfortunately, Alaska's existing airborne hunting statute is far more permissive than this when it comes to predator control. Since 1996, As 16.05.783 has been repeatedly amended to take away the basic standards put in place by a vote of a majority of Alaskans.

Even though Alaska's current airborne hunting statute no longer requires a finding of a biological emergency before airborne predator control can occur, it at least retains the requirement that there be a biological basis for the program. It requires the Board to determine, based on biological information from the department, that predation is an important cause for failure to achieve harvest or population objectives set by the Board before predator control can be authorized. This must also be done as part of a Game Management Plan.

The main provision of HB 256 (Section 8) deletes the requirement for a Game Management Plan and removes any need to link actual predation with the failure to achieve a stated prey population objective---in other words, the Board can just establish predator control programs regardless of whether a wolves or bears were the real problem. Under Section 8, the amended AS 16.05.783, the board only has to determine that a predator control program would be "conducive" to achieving human harvest or prey population objectives.

By eliminating the need to actually identify what the cause of the problem is, the state risks wasting large expenditures of public funds and resources on the wrong solution. For example, eliminating wolves when poor habitat or bears are the problem will fail to restore moose or caribou and move things in the wrong direction.

In our view, this takes the essential biological foundation of predator control programs away. Without scientific justification, we believe the program is not responsible game management. It will never have broad public support and will seriously damage the credibility of the Department of Fish and Game.

Valuable public wildlife resources deserve to be managed carefully. The National Academy of Sciences urged the state of Alaska to include more data and scientific support for predator control, not less. The American Society of Mammalogists has sent 3 letters of concern and passed a resolution regarding wolf management in Alaska. Issues surrounding Alaska's predator control were discussed in September 2006 at The Wildlife Society's annual meeting in Anchorage and concerns were raised over the scientific basis of the control programs. These concerns are based on knowing the end result of similar large-scale predator control programs in other areas of the world that were not based on sound science. Often,

predators subject to such programs were unable to sustain viable populations ( from a letter from 172 scientists and wildlife professionals to Governor Sarah Palin, dated September 25, 2007).

The obvious purpose of HB 256 is to make it as easy as possible to authorize predator control programs. We question why this is necessary. The Board has had no problem creating 5 programs over 60,000 square miles of central interior Alaska. This is the largest predator control effort since statehood. There seems to be no impediment to large -scale expansion of predator control programs now.

We urge that no legislative action be taken to remove the minimal requirement that predator control programs have a biological basis. It's simple. If predators are not the problem, they should not be removed. Sound science must demonstrate which type of predator, if any, is causing the problem.

By repealing 2 statewide initiatives, the legislature has gone against the will of the people of Alaska repeatedly. HB 256, by removing even the minimal standards for predator control that are left, further erodes public confidence in government.

We urge rejection of HB 256.



**TESTIMONY OF**

**TOM BANKS  
ALASKA REPRESENTATIVE, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE**

**BEFORE THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**REGARDING HOUSE BILL 256  
"ACTIVE GAME MANAGEMENT / AIRBORNE HUNTING"**

**JANUARY 30, 2008**

Co-Chairmen Rep. Craig Johnson and Rep. Carl Gatto and Members of the Select Committee, I am Tom Banks, Alaska Representative of Defenders of Wildlife. Founded in 1947, Defenders of Wildlife has over one million members and supporters across the nation, including 5,800 active Alaskan members, and is dedicated to the protection and restoration of native animals and plants in their natural communities. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

By way of introduction, I come from a family of hunters and fishers and have enjoyed these and many other outdoor activities. I am a volunteer assistant Scoutmaster at the Boy Scout troop at St. John United Methodist Church in Anchorage. I own a home in Anchorage. Before joining the staff of Defenders of Wildlife, I have been a naturalist, backcountry ranger and enforcement officer on state and federal lands in Alaska and elsewhere for twenty-five summers. I have a bachelor's degree in park and recreation administration and master's degree in ecology.

**Defenders of Wildlife strongly opposes House Bill 256 because the proposed  
legislation would**

- Thwart the intention of two voter-enacted bans on same day airborne hunting of wolves.
- Add brown bears to the list of species that can be shot by private aerial gunners.
- Eliminate the requirement that the Board of Game base its predator control programs on scientific information provided by the professionals at the Department of Fish and Game, and
- Limit public participation on issues that affect all of Alaska.

HB 256 would delete the requirement that a comprehensive game management plan be in place prior to invoking aerial predator control. Aerial predator control should only be considered when part of a very carefully thought-out program based on adequate supporting data, opportunity for public review, and public support.

HB 256 completely ignores and dismisses the intention of the voter-enacted bans on same-day airborne shooting of predators and seeks to move predator control decisions out of the realm of science and further toward an ideologically-driven decision-making process by the Board of Game, a body which is not diversely representative of a wide range of values that Alaskans place on their wildlife.

The Board of Game and certain hunting organizations claim that predator control is necessary to provide subsistence food for those whose survival depends on it. Unfortunately, this misrepresents the facts. Annual state harvest records show that the vast majority of the animals, two-thirds to three-quarters of the moose and caribou hunted in Alaska, are harvested by urban and out-of-state residents. Urban residents also harvest most of the animals in the majority of the current predator control areas. Rural people are often portrayed as the chief beneficiary of the predator control programs. Clearly, they are not. The desire to maintain the venerable tradition of hunting is important, but does not come with the guarantee that every hunting outing will yield a catch. Fair chase implies that a successful hunt is not guaranteed, but depends on the skill of the hunter and the natural abundance of prey.

More than 56,000 square miles are currently under airborne predator control by private pilots and gunners who secure a permit. This is nearly 9.8% of the state's total land area, or roughly one-third of the lands under state control. This sizeable portion of the state is currently subject to aerial shooting of predators. To increase the portion of Alaska wildlands subject to this practice – by loosening the standards in order to add them more hastily – is wrong and indefensible.

A state initiative sponsored by Alaskans for Wildlife is scheduled for a vote on August 26, 2008. HB 256 would re-write and tilt current law in a direction exactly opposite from the voters' intent. Over 56,000 Alaskans signed an initiative petition indicating they wanted to vote on this initiative. The Legislature should honor their wishes, not confuse the issue for them, and not undermine the initiative process by passing this legislation the way it is written.

Rather than streamlining the predator control process to make it less accountable to science and the Alaskan people, this important controversy should be decided on the basis of (1) the actions that a clear majority of Alaskans would find balanced and equitable; (2) the predator control, if any, that would be necessary in areas where there is true need to raise more prey for human sustenance or for protection of a prey population from experiencing a biological emergency, (3) the actions that are necessary to maintain the health of the landscape for the long run. It is well known that an excess of prey animals like moose or caribou can not be supported for the long term without damage to the habitat and impacts on their own health. Crowding an area with moose or caribou beyond the landscape's carrying capacity is not wise stewardship. "Conservation" or "stewardship" is what all hunters and non-hunters agree upon, and this requires a long-term vision – something which is lacking in this bill.

The proposed law would eliminate the requirement that the Board of Game determine that "predation is an important cause for the failure to achieve" prey numbers and hunter success, and that "a reduction of predation can reasonably be expected to aid in the achievement of the objectives." Instead, the Board would merely need to conclude that aerial or same-day airborne shooting "would be conducive" to meeting one of its prey objectives or harvest levels. This is a significant relaxation in the standard by which predator control areas are established.

The requirement that the Board of Game decisions be based on information from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would also be eliminated.

Like the existing intensive management statutes, the proposed bill fails to acknowledge the important role carnivores play in keeping ecosystems and prey populations healthy and vigorous. The widespread, intense culling of predators results in losses to ecosystem complexity, diversity, and function. This legislation positions the Board of Game to accelerate a program for political reasons – but without attention to whether such a program is fiscally prudent or biologically sound. The proposed legislation gives no recognition to the importance of conserving healthy ecosystems in their natural, wild condition – an important value that Alaskans and tourists from around the world recognize and experience each year in growing numbers. Alaska is special and unique, and with proper, conservative management, can remain that way.

To conclude, we strongly oppose liberalizing the existing, already one-sided intensive management statutes. Alaska needs wildlife management laws that promote science-based, effective, fiscally prudent wildlife management that addresses the legitimate needs and viewpoints of all user groups. While it is valid to allocate wildlife to satisfy legitimate needs for foodstuffs, we need to accept that it is impossible to satisfy a desire for an unlimited quantity of moose or caribou for a growing number of hunters, particularly from out-of-state, while keeping Alaska's wilderness character. Unfortunately, HB 256 is aimed toward continuing to elevate numbers of prey animals beyond the landscape's ability to support them, and thus the legislation is grossly unbalanced. Alaska needs sound wildlife management laws that ensure sustainable predator and game populations for generations to come on a landscape that can produce "only so much" while maintaining its full complement of predators and prey in a wild, untamed setting.

**Wildlife management should include a "best available science" standard that the Board is required to apply in its decision-making. And the public process should not be shortchanged.** It is clear that new legislation is needed in the future to address the deficiencies in the intensive management statutes, but this bill in no way addresses the problems and provides the balance that's needed. I strongly urge you to oppose this bill.

Thank you.

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** Mary A. Vavrik [mvavrik@gci.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 12:06 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Carl Gatto; Rep. Anna Fairclough; Rep. Bob Roses; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Bryce Edgmon; Rep. David Guttenberg; Rep. Scott Kawasaki  
**Cc:** Glooschenko, Valanne POA; bill morris  
**Subject:** HB 256

I am writing to ask that you vote NO to passage of HB 256. This bill will prevent any scientific oversight over the Board of Game predator control program! We have a system of checks and balances in our government, and those checks and balances should apply to the Board of Game, also. The Board of Game should not be allowed carte blanche authority to make decisions regarding wildlife or predator control in Alaska.

My understanding of the original mission of the Board of Game is for wildlife management for diversified users and to represent ALL Alaskans. It's been shown that the Board of Game consistently favors hunting and trapping above all other uses and values of wildlife, regardless of scientific evidence or public opinion to the contrary. Alaska's voters have TWICE voted against aerial killing of wolves, and to add brown bears and wolverines to the slaughter is unacceptable!

I am a voter and taxpayer, and I don't appreciate my hard earned tax dollars going toward such heinous acts as the unnecessary, expensive, and brutal massacre of innocent wildlife.

Please do not allow the passage of HB 256.

Thank you.

Mary A. Vavrik  
11930 Northern Raven Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99516-1935  
(907) 345-3934

## Jeanne Ostnes

---

**From:** Walter Glooschenko [gloosch@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 1:35 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** HB256

Alaskan voters have expressed their opposition to aerial hunting of wolves on several occasions. If passed into law, new proposed legislation (HB 256 and SB 176) would greatly increase killing of wolves statewide under the Board of Game. This would be done without requirement to consider any scientific evidence or even a review by Alaska Department of Fish and Game biologists. These bills will only make a bad law worse! Alaska's already excessive, expensive predator control program would be expanded irregardless of rationale or scientific review -- on the contrary, all decisions regarding increased, extreme predator control would be made solely by the Board of Game. Brown bears and wolverines would be added to the list of species that may be shot by aerial gunners. The proposed bills would destroy the intention of the voter-enacted ban on same-day airborne shooting of wolves, grizzly bears, and wolverines, making it much easier to increase this aerial killing. Also, the use of airplanes to track and shoot down wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines would be encouraged without requiring any comprehensive "game management plan" to be place beforehand. Alaska's wildlife deserves the best possible wildlife management --not mindless increase in extreme predator control! I urge the House Resources Committee to decline passage of HB 256 .

Dr. Walter A. Glooschenko  
6017 Doncaster Drive Anchorage, AK, 99504  
Phone: 222-1790; e-mail: gloosch@yahoo.com

---

Be a better friend, newshound, and  
know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now. [http://mobile.yahoo.com/;\\_ylt=Ahu06i62sR8HDtDypao8Wcj9tAcj](http://mobile.yahoo.com/;_ylt=Ahu06i62sR8HDtDypao8Wcj9tAcj)

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** Alaska Backcountry Hunters & Anglers [Alaskabha@starband.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 3:05 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Carl Gatto  
**Cc:** Governor Sarah Palin; Lloyd, Denby S (DFG)  
**Subject:** HB 256 - Gov. Palin's IM bill tomorrow House Resources

Dear Rep. Gatto and Rep. Johnson,

Hi, this is Mark Richards writing, co-chair of Alaska Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. I'm writing regarding the first hearing on Gov. Palin's Intensive Management bill (HB 256) tomorrow afternoon in the House Resources committee. I've been in discussion with ADFG and Dept of Law on this bill this past summer and fall, and our org opposes HB 256. We'd like to send in detailed comments but weren't sure if you were taking public comments at this time.

In a nutshell, we strongly support Governor Palin's attempt via this bill to make our state's predator management decisions "legally defensible," but the changes to our existing IM law that are in this bill have the potential to be worse than the "disease" we are now seeing with anti-hunters and other orgs suing the state every time we try to manage our predators. This bill, if passed, would take away definitions of biological terms such as "harvestable surplus" of game, remove mandates that the Board of Game receive and duly consider input from ADFG biologists and managers regarding prudent wildlife management, and legalize the aerial shooting of bears in Intensive Management areas solely at the discretion of the Board of Game. Essentially it gives all authority on future predator management decisions to the Board of Game.

We had hoped for the public discussion and debate on this bill that Governor Palin and Commissioner Lloyd said would take place last May when this bill was introduced at the close of the last session, but we have heard not one iota about this bill in the public arena since that time. I am cc-ing this to Commissioner Lloyd and the Governor so they are clear on our position. It is likely that Resources will hear that HB 256 would make it "harder" for the Board of Game to institute drastic measures of wolf and bear control in future, and this is certainly true. It's true because as stated the Board of Game would have sole discretion on whether or not to institute future predator control programs, and would not be "forced" as they now are under current IM law to initiate any controversial predator reduction programs. But there are two sides to this coin; on the flip side this bill if passed would also make it "easier" for the Board of Game to institute drastic measures of predator control. Indeed, we need to stop the frivolous lawsuits over our predator management schemes that cost the state (ADFG, Board of Game, Dept of Law) so much time and money, but this bill introduces too many potential downsides with its solution. It's possible that extensive legislative hearings and committee substitutes could change our position, but at this time we oppose HB 256.

Thank you very much for your time, and if you are accepting public comments please let us know and we will get ours off to you via email or fax.

Sincerely,

Mark Richards

[www.alaskabackcountryhunters.org](http://www.alaskabackcountryhunters.org)

1/29/2008

**Jeanne Ostnes**

---

**From:** Jack and Mary Lentfer [lentfer@gci.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2008 5:35 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** HB256

As a long-time Alaskan, an avid hunter, and a wildlife biologist who has worked for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and served on the Alaska Board of Game, I have serious concerns about HB256.

Adding brown bears to the list of species to be shot from the air in an attempt to make more game animals available to meat or trophy hunters is unthinkable. Brown bears have a low reproductive rate and populations recover slowly if they become depleted. They should not be threatened by being placed in a category where they can be considered as vermin. The State of Alaska loses credibility as a responsible resource manager with this type of action. A possible response is enactment of Federal law to take over management of brown bears on Federal lands in Alaska. A similar thing happened when polar bears were included in the Marine Mammal Protection Act because they were being hunted with aid of aircraft. With loss of State management, they can now be hunted only by Alaskan Natives.

Allowing the Board of Game to adopt same-day airborne predator control programs without consultation with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is another undesirable feature. It is almost beyond understanding that the Commissioner of Fish and Game would agree to this.

Nick Steen Pg 1



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resources  
 Committee name

Committee on HB 256, dated 1/30/08  
 Bill/Subject

I would like to make the following suggestions for changes to HB 256:

Sec 1(f), Page 1 (line 8 & 10) - Add coyote. Note 1.

Sec 3(e) & (f), Page 2 (line 12, 18 & 20) - Replace [moose, caribou and deer] with ungulates. Note 2.

Sec 6, Page 3 (line 4) - Replace [capture] with harvested. Note 3.

Sec 8, Page 4 (line 12) - Delete [free-ranging]. Note 4.

(Line 16) - Delete [wolverine] & add coyote, black bear. Note 5 & 6.

(Line 18) - Replace [moose, caribou and deer] with ungulates. Note 2.

Sec 9, Page 5 (line 11) Delete [wolverine] and add coyote, black bear. Note 5 & 6.

## Justifications:

1. Coyote have been shown to be a major predator on elk and antelope populations in the continental U.S. There is no reason to believe they could not have an impact on sheep, deer and possibly caribou in Alaska. Let's not have to go back and add to this legislation at a later date. Include all possible predators now and if they prove to be a problem, they can then be addressed without having to go back to the legislative process.

2. Replacing "moose, caribou and deer" with the term "ungulate" will cover all species possibly impacted by predators. It would include bison, musk ox, sheep, goat and elk in addition to moose, caribou and deer. See rationale in note 1.

3. Capture implies restraining a live animal, where as, harvest implies the killing and rendering into the hunters possession. For a non-resident hunter to "capture" and tag a brown bear would be a sight to behold!

Nick Steen Pg 2

4. Unnecessary verbiage.

5. Since coyote and black bear could be the cause of a decline in ungulate populations, they should be included in the list for a possible predator control program. Black bear are mentioned in Section 1 (f) and the legislation should maintain consistency.

6. Wolverine are not considered a predator, rather are considered a scavenger. They do kill at times, however, they are found in such low densities throughout the state, it is highly unlikely they could ever have an impact on ungulate populations.

If you have any questions you can call me at (907) 745-2739 or reply to this email address - steen@mtaonline.net.

THX Nick Steen

Signed: Comments received by email at Mtsu LFO  
Testifier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Representing (Optional)

HC32 Box 6561 Wasilla, Ak 99654

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

745-2739  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Phone number

## Debra Higgins

---

**From:** Louie Flora  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 30, 2008 12:17 PM  
**To:** Debra Higgins  
**Subject:** FW: concern about HB 256

Dear members of the House Resources Committee,

I want to express my continued dismay with the State's predator program. It disgusts me and I am deeply ashamed by the direction the State continues to hold in spite of what the majority of the public has voiced and the lack of science that would support the actions taken by the State.

My concern is with the fundamental premise of the management of game being so heavily weighted towards trying to achieve maximum harvest numbers of caribou and moose for human consumption rather than a genuinely science based approach to managing for a natural predator/ prey balance that has evolved over the millennia. In a sense, the State's way of management is akin to turning the natural balance of predator/prey populations into a 'farm' for human consumption.

Science will reveal that nothing in nature happens in a vacuum and that there are always unintended consequences when targeting one effect. In other words, you cannot just affect just one thing, there will always be unintended consequences. Alaska is not a farm so upsetting the natural balance of things is not only short sighted, it is costly in the financial and physical sense, but also costly to the State's credibility and standing within the greater citizenry. HB 256 'favors' only one user group when there are many user groups that are not being heard and are being negatively affected.

On a different subject that does not pertain directly to HB 256 or this committee, but reflects the trend of the powers that be, is how the State regards the natural environment, the web of life for which we humans are dependent upon. I am appalled by the Board of Game's continued push for allowing the hunting of coastal brown bears in the McNeil and Katmai areas. It sickens me to know these bears can be hunted especially since those in the field have made it known that their numbers are down. The State argues they are not down but the State holds no credibility especially when Sarah Palin accepts and uses junk science to say that polar bear numbers are up, are not threatened and maybe can 'learn' to hunt on land. I have no faith in the State regarding any environmental statements or assurances they are doing the right thing based on science. That would include the permitting process for mines and oil exploration, mixing zones, predator control programs, protection of Beluga whales in Cook Inlet, protection of the Tongas, Izenbeck, wetland preservation, you name it. I am sad the State of Alaska is so natural resource oriented, failing to tap into its incredible HUMAN resource, as well as failing to recognize that it is the irreplaceable natural environment and its inherent systems left intact that are Alaska's strongest and most sustainable assets.

Sincerely,

Rika Mouw  
Homer

**LIO Bethel**

---

**From:** Herman Morgan [hmorgan1954@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 30, 2008 9:39 AM  
**To:** LIO Bethel  
**Cc:** Junea\_LIO@legis.state.ak.us  
**Subject:** house bill 256

My Name is Herman Morgan, I live In Aniak, Rural Alaska, where we are suffering the effects of Animal Rights groups efforts to styme any kind of action to stop predators such as wolves from decimating our food supply.

People in groups such as defenders of wildlife have probably never known true hunger, not just ready for supper, but true hunger, not being able to feed their children like how they used to. Moose hunting has been severely limited in this area because of hunting closures.

What more scientific data do they need?

I have served on the Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committe for almost 30 years. I am telling you the truth, because I have seen it. As soon as animal rights people stopped arial wolf hunting( about 10 years ago) we saw a huge increase in wolves. Now they want to stop any kind of predator control.

I wish they would have some compassion on the plight of us Rural Alaskans who greatly depend on moose to feed our families.

They should understand that if they let the wolves increase until they decimate our and their food supply, the wolves that they hold in reverence will decrease, even to the point of them turning to cannabilism. It is better to control their numbers now so that we will all have moose and wolves.

Thank You.

Herman W. Morgan  
Aniak, Ak. 99557  
675-4393

Have predator control here where we need the moose.

---

Never miss a thing. [Make Yahoo your homepage.](#)

HB 256



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resources Committee  
 Committee name  
 Committee on HB 256, dated 1-30-08  
 Bill/Subject

I am testifying on behalf of myself. I urge the committee to vote in support of HB 256. It's time to stop the frivolous law-suits by radical animal rights extremists. It's time for aggressive predator control to restore our moose and caribou populations for all uses.

Signed: Todd L. Johnson  
 Testifier

SELF  
 Representing (Optional)  
4575 S. Hannas St. Wasilla AK  
99654

Address  
(907) 376-0465  
 Phone number

February 2, 2008

Representative Carl Gatto, Co-Chair  
House Resources Committee  
Re: HB 256

Dear Representative Gatto:

I am excited to learn of the Legislature's desire to make wildlife management for sustained yield a matter of science and sanity rather than a million dollar fund raiser for out-of-state ideologues.

For decades the Advisory Board process has existed as a democratic means by which all Alaskans can be clearly heard on all wildlife matters. On the other hand, special interest groups have used biased media to spread misinformation, pitting Alaskans against each other via the ballot measure process. One of the biggest deceptions has been to intentionally confuse fair chase hunting and predator control.

As a current member of the mid Kuskokwim Advisory Board, I represent Lime Village on the Stony River in Unit 19. I hear that predator control and temporary closure has initiated slow recovery of the moose population in the McGrath area. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case in the Stony River- Holitna drainages. Relatives in Nondalton say that there are few or no moose there as well.

In a way, what has happened to our region is good. In the short years of the Knowles administration we went from 2.4 moose per square mile to almost nothing, primarily due to wolf predation. During the 60's through the 80's, every family had enough meat to get through the winter. In the fall seasons of 2006 and 2007, not one family in Lime Village harvested a moose. The devastation of predators in the 30's and farther back is too distant for today's population to recall. We are the modern day example before modern eyes, although urban media has failed to accurately report our situation. Let us learn, and never again make the mistakes implemented under the Knowles administration.

History statistically demonstrates that, with good predator management, Unit 19 is able to sustain large numbers of moose. Without predator management, the country is a graveyard. The State Constitution mandates sustained yield. Never again can we allow politically driven agendas, biased media and out-of-state ideologies to manipulate our most valuable renewable resources.

Any legislation that makes scientific management of wildlife by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game more effective should quickly be adopted.

I urge the passing of HB 256.

Thank you.

Cordially,

Alan Dick  
Lime Village

**Debra Higgins**

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Martin Antuna [mantuna@gci.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 02, 2008 7:47 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** Oppose HB 256!

Feb 2, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As an Alaskan who is concerned about the long-term conservation of wildlife species and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

HB 256 would make our "intensive management" law worse by renaming it "active management" and giving the Board of Game a completely free hand to control predators -- the Board would merely need to think that airborne or same-day airborne shooting would be "conducive" to meeting a prey objective. The concept of aerial gunning of carnivores to reduce predator populations in order to artificially and unsustainably boost game populations -- is a practice that will primarily benefit urban and

out-of-state hunters, not rural hunters with demonstrated needs. This practice goes against the ecological balance we boast about.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Mr. Martin Antuna  
6416 15th Ct Apt A  
Elmendorf AFB, AK 99506-2005

Part I

When it comes to the wildlife existence, I think that GOD created everything with a purpose. The purpose was to feed human when necessary, as subsistence, and for people to enjoy them. God didn't give the authority to completely eliminate them, as Sarah Palin the governor wants, as we know nature can take care of itself, since God is perfect and whatever he made is perfect. Some politicians want to twist the creation of GOD for their own purposes. Talking about wildlife population balance, they shouldn't alter the way nature was designed by GOD. Governor Sarah Palin wants to satisfy her own and rich friends ego, by killing wild animals for sport. On January 30, 2008 she named two more Alaska Fish and Game Board members Sager Albaugh, who served as president of the Alaska outdoors council, the state largest and most important sportsman's group. Bradley Echoed is an avid sheep hunter. In the Fish and Game Board there is no Alaskan native's representatives, they are all white people. They serve to the interest of the rich and business people. So that means Sarah Palin it is going to kill the wolves animals that don't produce any money and the animals that kill moose, caribou, etc. Sarah Palin doesn't want congressman from California to interfere in the Alaska wildlife. The reality is that Palin doesn't listen to the Alaskans opinions. She only listens to the people who agree with her ideologies and convenience, Sarah Palin said to let Alaskan decide to manage wildlife in the state, in first place Sarah Palin was born in Idaho, not Alaska, why is she asking Congressmen George Miller to stop fighting for wildlife animals up here to let Alaskan decide, what to do with them, besides that she is behind all this wildlife extermination issue. Congressman Miller knows that the state of Alaska is part of the 50 states that form this great nation, so he has the right to defend and save his nation from destruction caused by a few politicians.

The tourists come to Alaska to see and enjoy the landscape and wild animals. That we still have here. Is about time to study why animals are coming close to populated areas. Why animals get aggressive sometimes, the reason is that they are been displaced by humans. If an intruder comes to your house, to live without your permission, you would fight back right away. We are the ones who came and invaded their territory. So we need to find a solution instead to killing them indiscriminately, Animals mark their borders. Any domesticated animal gets aggressive when is been disturbed, not only wild animals. They are looking for food and they don't shoot anybody in the city like people do. We don't spend a penny to feed them to take care of them. They take care of themselves. We need to respect, protect and stop killing them with no reason. Some politicians like the profits they make from the animals but at the same time they dislike them. The animals have value because God made them.

We think the politicians and legislators should be working for the best of the country and trying to preserve the natural resources, not for popularity or to please people for votes and give them what they ask for. We are glad God said in Samuel 1-7 for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart.

Yolanda de la Cruz  
806 W. 57<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Anchorage, AK. 99518

PART 2

Recently everyday the media is trying to convince people that it is necessary to kill wolves and bears to preserve the moose. Don't blame the animals and use the Bears and Wolves for the peoples fault. You should blame the Fish and Game Advisory Committee and Fish Board for the open hunting. They are the ones who manage the wildlife's species and they do it for their own convenience and purpose. Does a person need to hunt if they drive a \$ 40,000.00 pickup pulling \$ 40,000.00 worth of ATVS? Does fair chase mean ripping up the tundra or screaming up a river in a hovercraft? It is time to consider "HUNTER CONTROL, NOT PREDATOR CONTROL". The media was said last week that the Fish and Game Board decided to go to Hatcher's Pass and exterminate all the moose. In another place, they opened the hunting for moose and they killed all the moose and even the calves. Right now, they are trying to protect the moose population. It is not because they care about moose, it is because moose hunting is a big business controlled by a few people. Remember, there used to be 60, million buffalo and abundant predators, but the rifle, in 20 years, brought the herds to near extinction. ACCORDING TO God's word, it says that animals should be killed only to eat. You call it " SUBSISTENCE". To kill animals as a SPORT IS CRUEL, AND INHUMANE. The wolves are UNIQUE and they are only several thousands and we can not reproduce them because they live in the wild. However we can reproduce the dogs because they are domestic. The dogs live inside warm house, and they have owners, food, vet etc. THE WOLVES HAVE TO WORK FOR THEIR OWN FOOD. THEY ARE RISKING THEIR LIVES EVERYDAY AND THEY SUFFER FROM DISEASES, WHICH ARE KILLING THEM. AS IF THAT WERE NOT ENOUGH, NOW WHEN THE WOLVES LOOK FOR FOOD, THEY FIND DEATH INSTEAD FROM TRAPS. THIS IS INHUMANE AND CRUEL. How come people can accept these atrocities. THIS COUNTRY WAS BUILT UPON THE BIBLE AND SOMEDAY GOD WILL JUDGE EACH OF US ACCORDING TO OUR ACTIONS. WE WILL HAVE TO GIVE AN ACCOUNT TO GOD. IF WE DON'T HAVE COMPASSION WHILE WE ARE ON THE EARTH, GOD WON'T HAVE MERCY ON US. Recently Fish and Game Advisory and Fish Board had a meeting about wanting to exterminate WOLVES, females BEARS and WOLVES PUPS THAT ARE IN THEIR DENS. WE THINK THAT IS SAVAGE, BARBARIC AND UNACCEPTABLE. IT SOUNDS LIKE TERRORISM AGAINST THE WILD ANIMALS.

Politicians should be more worried about controlling crime in Alaska, especially in Anchorage, instead of taking advantage of killing defenseless animals. The animals come close to the people and city because they are hungry and they are looking for food. They don't shoot people as Christopher Erin Rogers Jr. did. He was killing people from Palmer to Anchorage and none of the politicians say anything. You should pay more attention when people kill people instead of being worried when animal kill animals. When animals kill animals it is their nature. God made them that way. It looks like politicians are insensitive to crime. If the politicians don't pay attention to crime in Anchorage, they are less likely to pay attention to the animals.

Yolanda de la Cruz  
806 W. 57th Avenue  
Anchorage, AK. 99518

**Joe Klutsch**  
**Katmai Guide Service**  
PO Box 313 • King Salmon, AK 99513

February 4, 2008

Testimony for HB256

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee:

My name is Joe Klutsch, I currently serve as president of the Alaska Professional Hunters Association and am here to speak on behalf of our hunting guide members as well as myself. After nearly forty years of living in rural Alaska, hunting and guiding big game animals around the state, I trust you will consider my comments carefully.

There is a great hunting tradition in our state, as stated in the publication *Predation Management in Alaska*. "It is integral to lifestyles, traditional cultures, the economy and basic food needs for many Alaskan families." I will add that many of those families are guiding families who share substantial amounts of meat with people who would otherwise not have access to wild game.

The issue at hand is the dwindling numbers of moose, caribou, Dall sheep and other ungulate species that has occurred over the last 15 years. Most of these declines can be directly attributable to ever increasing numbers of predators—particularly wolves—especially in western and south central Alaska. Historically active predator management resulted in higher numbers of game species allowing for sustainable long term use by hunters. Since the 1980's, efforts to manage predator numbers has been curtailed—the result being continuing loss of opportunity.

Opponents of this bill would like you to believe that no predator control efforts should be undertaken until a threshold of "biological emergency." This is simply unacceptable. It intentionally ignores the fact that at that point in the allocation equation non-resident and general resident seasons are closed and in most cases subsistence seasons are curtailed to Tier I or Tier II where there are not enough animals to allow for a sustainable harvest. Allowing this to occur, we will find many of our game species in the proverbial predator pit where recovery may take decades. We have a constitutional and even moral obligation not to allow this to happen.

Nothing in this legislation spells doom for predators. To the contrary it gives ADF&G and the Alaska Board of Game (with thorough public input from all effected parties) the ability to authorize and undertake properly justified and measured predator management programs. It allows us to act before we find ourselves in a management crisis. Acting only in the case of a biological emergency is acting too late.

Failure to actively manage predator species, particularly wolves is and will continue to have a devastating effect on all Alaskan who rely on prey species.

In conclusion:

I urge you to do what is right and move this legislation on to passage.

Thank you.

Joe Klutsch



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resources Committee  
committee name

committee on HB No. 256, dated 5/11/07  
bill/subject

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Testifier Joan Andersen  
Joan Andersen

No affiliation

Representing (Optional)

1110 W. 6th Avenue, #503, Anchorage, AK 99501

Address

907-279-4024

Phone No.

My name is Joan Andersen and I have lived in Anchorage since 1983. I am not affiliated with any group or organization. I wanted to testify in person today (1/29/08), but time ran out for public testimony on this bill.

I strongly oppose passage of HB 256. This bill if implemented, could lead to the elimination of predators from Alaska. The Lower 48 eliminated wolves and other predators years ago, and as a result, many states have an excessive number of deer and other ungulates, and unhealthy ecosystems. Lyme disease in humans (caused by deer ticks) is a direct result of the over population of deer in the Lower 48.

I was at the meeting of the Board of Game last weekend, and one prominent board member referred to animals in the wild as "critters." This term says it all. It diminishes the importance of animals to zero. Animals do not count in the collective mind of the supporters of this bill; only the interests of humans count.

The same can be said for the use of the term "harvesting" wolves. What is being done under HB 256, and the original law, is not "harvesting" wolves, as you would "harvest" a crop of wheat, but rather "killing" wolves. I believe the term "harvesting" has been deliberately used so that the public views predators as inanimate objects or things and thus the public is less emotional about the issue of same-day aerial hunting of wolves and other predators.

I also believe this bill is up for passage because the wealthy, powerful interests which include monied, out-of-state hunters, wish to bag moose and caribou in as easy a manner as possible, which happens when ungulates are unnaturally increased due to the elimination of predators. These monied interests support members of the legislature and Board of Game, and thus supporters of this bill are only too happy to accommodate the desires of the rich and powerful hunters and hunting organizations to the detriment of the majority of the State's residents.

The revisions to the old law, which was bad enough already, would in my opinion not be up for consideration if subsistence hunters were the backers. The natives and rural residents, who may really need the meat caribou and moose provide, are not responsible for this bill. The monied hunters only hunt for sport, and not to put meat on the table, but they have the voice that is listened to, and they are responsible for the new bill. This situation is not acceptable to a public which loves Alaska for its wildlife and natural viewing opportunities, including viewing wolves and bears.

This new bill only worsens an already out-of-kilter ecosystem caused by the original aerial hunting statute. Passage of the new bill would further erode Alaska's ecosystems and the balance between prey and predators. It is completely unnecessary, and bottom line, it will prove harmful to the State of Alaska. Please do not pass HB 256.

## **House Bill 256 Would Eliminate Any Science Oversight of the Alaska Predator Control Program!**

On Jan. 30, 2:00 PM, the Juneau House Resources Committee will consider legislation that would open the doors to greatly increased killing of wolves, bears and wolverines statewide, without necessity or requirement to consider scientific rationale behind such action. This legislation, HB 256, would also eliminate analysis or review from the Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game for such increased predator control. A similar piece of legislation has been introduced in the Senate (Senate Bill 176).

A video link will be provided at the Legislative Information Office, 716 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Anchorage. The public is welcome to attend and to speak regarding HB 256 (sign up by 1:00PM).

HB 256 is expected to:

- Make a bad law worse, giving the Board of Game a completely free hand to control predators.**
- Expand Alaska's already excessive, expensive predator control programs and pave the way for the Board of Game to increase this unnecessary killing by leaving decisions up to this Board.**
- Destroy the intention of the voter-enacted ban on the same-day airborne shooting of wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines, making it much easier to increase the aerial killing of these animals.**
- Add brown bears and wolverines to the list of species that may be shot by aerial gunners.**
- Permit the use of airplanes to track and shoot down wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines without requiring any comprehensive "game management plan" to be placed beforehand.**

This proposed legislation is not scientifically defensible -- it would undermine balanced management of the wildlife belonging to all Alaskans!

Contact: Citizens Concerned for Alaska Wildlife  
[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/alaska\\_wildlife](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/alaska_wildlife)  
907-274-5933

Mr. Tom Banks  
Alaska Field Representative, Defenders of Wildlife  
[tbanks@defenders.org](mailto:tbanks@defenders.org)  
907-276-9410



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resource  
 committee name  
 committee on HR 256, dated 1-30-08  
 bill/subject

**From:** Rebecca [caseload@att.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 30, 2008 10:05 AM  
**To:** LIO Anchorage  
**Subject:** Predator Control

Please stop House Bill 256, which eliminates the few remaining standard governing the predator control program and would allow predator-control expansion across the state. This bill takes science and public input out of the process. Our public voice is important to Alaska and how it's governed. This bill removes scientific standards by saying the state game board can authorize predator control by simply finding it would be conducive to growing more big game.

Alaska needs to have a comprehensive wildlife management plan to start predator control in given area. Such plans give the public a chance to weigh in on wildlife values other than harvesting meat.

With a comprehensive wildlife management plan, the state Fish and Game Department would have to scientifically justify that predators are a problem and that the control program would be successful.

Sincerely,  
 Rebecca Case  
 8376 E. Stormy Hill Cir.  
 Wasilla, AK

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Testifier  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Representing (Optional)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone No.

## Debra Higgins

---

**From:** Defenders of Wildlife [defenders@mail.defenders.org] on behalf of Lee Pulliam [lplee@arctic.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 06, 2008 2:04 PM  
**To:** Rep. Craig Johnson  
**Subject:** An urgent message about HB 256

Feb 6, 2008

Representative Craig Johnson  
120 4th Street  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Johnson,

As a constituent who is concerned about the long-term conservation of Alaska's wildlife and maintaining healthy, diverse ecosystems, I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 256.

Don, if you're looking for support from Alaskans in your re-election campaign, you NEED to oppose this bill!

HB 256 is bad news for Alaskans and Alaska wildlife for the following reasons:

- \* It ignores public opinion regarding the use of airplanes to kill wildlife Alaskans have twice voted through statewide ballot measures to restrict this practice -- and makes it much easier to shoot wolves and other predators using airplanes. Under existing law, nearly 700 wolves have already been killed by aerial hunters. This isn't management, it's a massacre -- and now they want to increase the killing.

- \* For the first time ever, it would sanction aerial bear hunting.

Brown bears are slow to reproduce and should be managed conservatively. This is an unprecedented and totally irresponsible move.

- \* It allows for the aerial gunning of carnivores to reduce predator populations in order to artificially and unsustainably boost game populations -- a practice that will primarily benefit urban and

out-of-state hunters, not rural hunters with demonstrated needs. It's more about greed than need.

- \* Set a disastrous precedent for giving the Board of Game carte blanche control over the state's aerial predator control policies -- without requiring them to consider any public input or the best

available scientific evidence. This bill would allow for even greater politicization of the policy-setting process.

- \* Eliminate the need for a comprehensive "game management plan" to be in place before predator control can take place.

Current law already requires predator control when the Board of Game makes certain findings. HB 256 would eliminate any standards for predator control.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important wildlife matter.

Sincerely,

Mr. Lee Pulliam  
11820 Ellen Ave  
Anchorage, AK 99515-3304

## Friday Testimony

Thank you chair and members of Natural Resource Committee for allowing me to testify in opposition of HB 256.

My name is Martin Wade Willis  
I live in Anchorage Alaska

I have Bachelors Degree in Zoology, I am a past employee of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and have owned a guiding business in Alaska for 10 years and I'm an avid moose hunter

Chair and members of the committee I'm very concerned about the lack of well rounded testimony provided by the Dept. of Law and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Last week I quickly pointed out to the Committee that neither the ADF&G nor the Dept. Of Law had specifically addressed the fact that HB 256 is not redefining, but eliminating, the words "based on scientific information". Both the Dept. Of Law and the Fish and Game strongly testified that this bill simply clarifies conflicting language in the current regulations but in fact HB 256 provides far more substantial changes to the current statute. The most unacceptable being that, for the first time, it allows the "opinion" of the board of game to substitute for science as the only requirement in the regulations to initiate arial predator control, including arial gunning of bears.

Testimony provided by the ADF&G and the Dept. Of Law seem to indicate their prejudice toward passage of this bill, not their intent to fully inform the members of this committee of the bills content or it's intent.

Rod Arno on the other hand enthusiastically supported the available science by waving a copy of it as he testified in support of predator control.

The ADF&G also testified that shooting wolves by plane was analogous to shooting waterfowl. In fact shooting from a plane is also analogous to shooting from a boat, which is illegal in most, if not all, jurisdictions in this state due to unacceptable injury to game. The Fish & Game choose not to mention that. There is one major difference though, a plane is traveling at roughly 100mph. Try shooting at that speed from a boat. So I ask, why would the Fish and Game testify they have no concerns at all about arial gunning? Why would the Fish and Game not even have minimal regulations requiring exclusive use of a shotgun when arial gunning? It clearly suggests the ADF&G's testimony in regards to HB 256 is biased.

Rep. Gotto states there is no way Alaska can afford to pay for Fish and Game employees to handle predator control by helicopter. I say, there is no way the state can afford not to, especially if the residents of Alaska intend to continue arial predator control. As a past biologist for the state I can assure you the Fish and Game desperately needs logistical support to access the vast regions of this state. State run predator control programs can provide the transparency the citizens require for such a drastic wildlife management technique. Why would the legislature, or this committee, prefer HB 256 to such a win-win proposition, especially at a time when Alaska's revenues are at record levels?

The citizens of Alaska are woefully tired of special interest groups controlling our states natural resources. When 57,000 residents sign a petition to put arial predator control back on the ballet for an unprecedented third time the legislature should have an overwhelming respect for the citizens intent.

'HB 256 does not attempt to bring all the citizens of this state to the table. HB 256 tries to establish the will of the few on the will of the many, which is the status quo the voters in Alaska are now rejecting in record numbers. This committee should do the right thing, represent all of Alaska while impressing their constituents by sending a clear message to the Board of Game, the ADF&G and especially the legislature and the Governor that the time has come when all Alaskan's will be allowed to participate in the management of our states wildlife resources. We must include everybody, especially if folks like me, the hunter, are to survive!

Please vote against HB 256.

Martin Wade Willis  
1308 W. 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Anchorage Ak. 99503

907-223-0218  
[adventure@alaska.com](mailto:adventure@alaska.com)

BS Degree from Colorado State University in Zoology  
Owner of Guide/Outfitter business based in Alaska for 10 years  
Former ADF&G biologist

I strongly oppose **HB256** for the following reasons:

1. Rebukes and ignores the public's intent - **3 ballot initiatives - Unprecedented!**

- 1996 - Alaska votes against arial predator control
- 2000 - Alaska votes again - restricting arial predator control to ADF&G personnel only!
- **57,000 Alaska residents sign a petition to put arial wolf control back on the ballot in 2008!**
- 57,000 Alaskan's that may vote you out of office if you ignore them along with the 85% of Alaskan's that do not hunt, rather, they value a natural, wild Alaska. Seeing wolves and bears is one of their most cherished experiences and one they will fight for!

2. Removes requirements for "Science Based Management"

- This bill is not simplifying the language to the mandates governing the Board of Game. **This bill is rewriting them.** This bill attempts to remove language that the Board of Game is having difficulty with in regards to justifying predator control programs, especially the word "science based". The Dept. Of Law and the ADF&G would like you to believe this bill simply clarifies issues - **ITS NOT THE TRUTH.** This bill's intent is to remove the public, the courts and scientists from the predator control issue.
- There is no need to remove science based requirements. Rod Arno himself, the AOC's spokesmen, sat right in front of you waving what he himself described as "great science" in regards to predator control issues. Please, for heavens sake, don't ignore Rod Arno! He's predator controls biggest advocate and Alaska's greatest citizen to date! His testimony is sacred!
- 2006 - The prestigious, American Society of Mammalogist's, passes a resolution condemning Alaska's predator control programs and calling on the Board of Game to use science based data to design predator control programs.
- 2005 - Alaska's and the nations top wildlife management processionals, 120 in all, send a letter to the Governor urging science based management of Alaska predators **AND PREY!**

3. **Arial gunning of predators is inhumane**

- **Shooting game from the deck of a boat is illegal in Alaska. The ADF&G considers the practice inhumane, but they forgot to mention that during their testimony. The ADF&G state a hunter cannot humanely dispatch game while shooting from a boat. Not with a shotgun, rifle or machine gun due to the unstable shooting platform! How can a plane, flying at 100 mph, shooting a distance of at least 100 yards be any better! There is no way you can shoot effectively from a plane!**
- **Shooting from a plane is analogous to shooting animals from a boat, not sitting still though, a boat moving at 100 mph!**
- **The ADF&G would like you to think shooting wolves from a plane is analogous to shooting ducks from a blind - THAT'S NOT TRUE!**

4. **HB 256 would add bears to the list of animals that can be legally gunned down by air**

- **Arial gunning of bears would destroy Alaska's tiny reputation for managing our states wildlife resources responsibly. Tourism, Alaska's largest family owned industry, would suffer tremendously.**
- **Hunters rights would be at great risk from a Nation and a State that have 85% or more individuals that DO NOT HUNT. They would attack Alaskan's hunting rights with a vengeance!**

**Alaskan's want and will support science based predator control management that clearly demonstrates both the need and the effectiveness of arial predator control programs.**

**Alaskan's want and will support ADF&G personnel conducting helicopter based, arial predator control should it be necessary. State managed arial predator control has the transparency and oversight necessary for the citizens of Alaska to support arial predator control, in my opinion.**

**Do the right thing - oppose HB 256.**

**Bonnie Gruening**

---

**From:** Seth Kantner [sethkantner@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 08, 2008 1:30 PM  
**To:** Rep. Carl Gatto  
**Subject:** Public comment

Dear Sir,

I wasn't able to get the electronic testimony form to work without a fax machine. The LIO here in Kotzebue wasn't much more help. Please get this to the House Resources Committee. And please let me know if you receive this.

Thanks.  
Seth Kantner

**Dear House Resources Committee Members:**

**My name is Seth Kantner, resident of Kotzebue, lifelong resident of NW Alaska. I'm a hunter, wildlife photographer, commercial fisherman, and formerly a trapper.**

**I'd like to urge you to vote against HB 256, the bill to allow the Board of Game the power to alone and without biological science make decisions about predator control in Alaska.**

**I have a lot I could say about predator control, but that's not the issue here. The issue is that these people--BOG members--are appointed by the governor and are not representative of the bush or native or subsistence-users of our state. This proposed law feels like low logic, anti-good science--and like nepotism.**

**Nepotism because the Board of Game members, as we've seen lately and all too clearly, are either Alaska Outdoor Council people or people with trophy hunting interests in mind. These are not biologists, nor are they people who understand hunting for food, or understand the bush, or natives, or any of what we do here in a huge portion of Alaska. They are trophy hunters with trophy hunting as their agenda. Like I stated above, this all looks and feels like a sick little circle.**

**People in the villages--where i have spent my life--deserve a voice, they deserve good management of animal resources, and they don't deserve to be shut out of this process. And actually, neither does the rest of Alaska, the wildlife enthusiasts, the photographers, etc.**

**When and if the BOG has a Native member, a real bush person, a photographer, a biologist, a non-consumptive user of wildlife, etc--maybe then this proposed law could work. Right now it just makes our elected officials look like a bunch of sneaky, self-serving, good old boys circumventing us. We don't like that.**

**Thanks for your time and for serving our state.**

**Sincerely,**

2/8/2008

**Seth Kantner**

--Seth--

[www.kapvikphotography.com](http://www.kapvikphotography.com)

---

Looking for last minute shopping deals? [Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.](#)

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES

2006 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 06-14

RES 1

**TITLE:** REQUESTING DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE AND ALASKA WILDLIFE ALLIANCE TO WITHDRAW THEIR LAWSUIT TO STOP THE STATE OF ALASKA'S PREDATOR MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND CEASE MAKING INACCURATE PUBLIC STATEMENTS THAT THEIR OPINIONS REPRESENT "ALL THE PUBLIC INTERESTS" UNTIL THEY HAVE CONSULTED WITH, AND OBTAINED CONCURRANCE OR PERMISSION OF, ALL AFFECTED TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS ON THE ISSUE.

**WHEREAS:** Alaska's Native community has repeatedly expressed its strong concerns, desire and support of predator management programs to be implemented in their respective areas to provide for basic subsistence needs through AFN Resolution Numbers 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08, 04-09 and 05-13 (reaffirmed and incorporated here be reference) that have passed the AFN Convention unanimously for the last six years; and

**WHEREAS:** Moose, an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska, have undergone significant declines of as much as 75-80% in many areas where long-term consistent human harvest and environmental conditions have not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge along with the most direct and credible scientific information available, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily due to increased numbers of predator populations since the ballot initiatives of 1996 and 2000 were fostered and imposed on the entire state by animal welfare organization proponents; and

**WHEREAS:** These concerns as expressed have become especially manifested in the Kuskokwim region where large customary and traditional subsistence use areas of former high moose numbers such as GMU 19A (which still retains highly productive but now unutilized habitat, high pregnancy and birth rates, but very poor calf survival or population recruitment), have been severely restricted to Tier II subsistence drawing hunts only, or closed completely to all subsistence hunting opportunity; and

**WHEREAS:** AFN Resolution #04-09 directly informed Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups critical of predator management programs in Alaska that their activities were hurtful at best and hostile at worst to providing for subsistence needs and requested that they work with the people most directly and negatively affected rather than against us; and

**WHEREAS:** To date there has been no known acknowledgement much less response to this request by Defenders or its affiliates in this matter, and instead our concerns have in essence been rejected with the filing of yet another "technical" legal challenge by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance to the State's few predator management programs on August 25, 2006, citing a lack of sufficient "scientific information" or "public support"; and

**WHEREAS:** Such actions either discount or completely disregard the "public support" for these programs and concerns for subsistence interests that are clearly stated in the AFN Resolutions referenced above, or dismiss AFN's membership as a "public" whose interests and support is not worthwhile or worthy of consideration on this issue.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates of the 2006 Annual Convention believe that public statements and press releases made by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance in their current lawsuit that claim "predator management program decisions stem from individuals who have no regard for sound science, the will of the public and who have no long-term vision for the management of Alaska's natural heritage" are insensitive at best and insulting at worst to the long sought recognition and implementation of these programs by Alaska village residents; are against the best interests of providing for subsistence needs in Alaska's Native villages; and are in direct conflict with traditional environmental knowledge and other concerns expressed in the AFN resolutions for the past six years.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Delegates demand that unless the Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance do not wish to recognize Alaska Native villages or bush Alaska residents as having a legitimate public interest on this issue, they stop saying that their activities represent "all the public" until they have consulted with, and obtained documented permission of all affected Tribal organizations throughout the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim and Yukon River drainages, and other regions affected by this issue, and in the future they are requested to please have the courtesy, decency, integrity or accountability to make such statements accurately reflect that the public they represent is their own constituency - not everyone else and most certainly not ours!

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT by the Delegates that if Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance truly support Alaska's subsistence priority and reasonable subsistence harvest opportunity as they have publicly stated in the past, they would withdraw their lawsuit to stop the State of Alaska's predator management programs.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

2006 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 06-12

- TITLE:** REASSERTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA'S RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE FOR AMOUNTS NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE, REASONABLE HARVEST OPPORTUNITY AND REGAIN COMPLIANCE WITH RELATED STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS
- WHEREAS:** Moose remain an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska, yet populations have undergone significant declines of 75-80% in many areas over the last decade where long-term consistent human harvest has not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge along with the most direct and credible scientific information available, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily attributable to increased numbers of predator populations since the early 1990's, when animal welfare proponents substantially elevated imposition of their opinions on the State through political manipulations; and
- WHEREAS:** The Association of Village Council Presidents, Bristol Bay Native Association and Tanana Chiefs Conference, have all expressed high levels of concern about this situation, repeatedly requesting that predator management programs be implemented in their respective areas through AFN Resolution #'s 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08, 04-09, and 05-13 (reaffirmed and incorporated here by reference) that have passed the Alaska Federation of Natives for the last six years; and
- WHEREAS:** A few existing predator management programs, some of which have been on the books for 15 years or more, have only recently been implemented or reactivated after their prohibition in the early 1990's, brought on through successful public manipulation by animal welfare groups that resulted in long-term lack of administrative support; and
- WHEREAS:** Efforts are being repeated by animal welfare advocates through another lawsuit filed in August, 2006, citing "a lack of sufficient scientific information" and the lack of "public support", to effectively stop the few predator management programs that are under way and prevent the state department of fish & game from utilizing these or similar programs as a viable management tool at any time in the future; and

**WHEREAS:** Such statements discount or completely disregard the "public support", and concerns for subsistence interests that are clearly stated in the AFN Resolutions referenced above, or dismiss that membership as a "public" whose interests and support is not worthwhile or of lesser importance in this issue; and

**WHEREAS:** Despite statements from organizational representatives or others who make public claims to support predator management, but only if "it is based on sound science", it has become increasingly clear in recent decades that no amount of scientific information will ever be adequate to satisfy those groups or individuals who incorporate philosophical or moral superiority arguments into opposing predator management programs in bush Alaska, and who will simply continue to label any science as "good", "bad", or "insufficient" depending only upon whether they agree with those values and opinions – real applied "science" for most will have little bearing, regardless of source or merit; and

**WHEREAS:** A key observation of the National Academy of Sciences report (Wolves, Bears, and Their Prey in Alaska contracted by the State from 1994-97) was that it was difficult to assess many of Alaska's predator management programs because they were consistently stopped (mainly through political action/interference) within a few years rather than being conducted for the full duration (of up to 5 or more years) originally and scientifically deemed necessary; and

**WHEREAS:** Failure to actively incorporate and implement predator management programs as a basic management function undermines the state's subsistence priority law and related regulations governing the determination of amounts necessary for subsistence uses and providing a reasonable harvest opportunity; and

**WHEREAS:** Allowing moose populations to become depleted and remain at low levels violates the Alaska Constitution which mandates, among other things, principles of maximum use and benefit, common use, sustained yield, broad diversity of use, and uniform application for all those similarly situated regarding the subject matter at hand.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates to the 2006 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives that the Alaska Federation of Natives and member organizations are requested to consider intervening in the lawsuit filed by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance against the State of Alaska to halt predator management programs based on the opposing opinions of their "scientists" which are inconsistent with direct year-round local environmental knowledge and the opinions of area management biologists and, which in the past has resulted in the State of Alaska failing to manage for amounts necessary for subsistence and reasonable harvest opportunity, and to be out of compliance with at least 5 sections of Article VIII's constitutional standards and principles

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT in the future the critics of predator management programs should be required to provide conclusive scientific evidence that such programs are not effective in achieving their intended purposes, which are to increase the number of moose available for subsistence harvest, provide for a reasonable harvest opportunity and to comply with constitutional standards before predator management programs can be suspended or discontinued by political or administrative actions based on speculation, abstract scientific assertions, philosophical or social differences of opinion.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT AFN continue to actively follow-up on this resolution and further develop the issue in accordance with this and prior AFN Tier 1 resolutions.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

2005 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 05-13

**TITLE:** SUPPORT OF STATE ADMINISTRATION TO REBUILD, MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ALASKA'S MOOSE POPULATIONS AND OPPOSITION TO BALLOT INITIATIVES PREEMPTING EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO PROVIDE FOR REASONABLE SUBSISTENCE OPPORTUNITY

**WHEREAS:** Moose are an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska that have undergone significant declines of 75-80% in many areas over the last decade where long-term consistent human harvest has not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily attributable to increased numbers of predator populations since the ballot initiatives of 1996 and 2000 were fostered and successfully imposed on the entire state by conservation and animal welfare constituencies; and

**WHEREAS:** The Association of Village Council Presidents, Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Bristol Bay Native Association, have all expressed high levels of concern about these population declines, repeatedly requesting that predator management programs be implemented in their respective areas through Resolution #'s 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08 & 04-09 that have passed the Alaska Federation of Natives unanimously for the last five years. Ongoing concerns of concurrence have also been expressed by state and federal management support staff, affected Federal Regional Subsistence Councils, State Fish & Game Advisory Committees and Board of Game; and

**WHEREAS:** The Federal Subsistence Board has chosen to interpret through its Predator Management Policy that its "management" regime can only address the human harvest component of subsistence, and does not have authority to enact regulations, implement activities, or require programmatic agency response that would directly, substantively, effectively or actively manage populations such as moose and wolves even though predator control is a commonly approved practice, direct or sanctioned management action, conducted by federal agencies in several lower 48 states, as well as by governments in many other countries throughout the northern hemisphere; and

**WHEREAS:** Existing predator management programs in regulation, some of which have been in place for up to 15 years and/or more recently requested to be implemented by bush Alaska residents for years have only recently (in 2003) been allowed to be reactivated after a 10 year prohibition; and

RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

**WHEREAS:** It is important to rural Alaska residents for environmental or animal welfare groups to acclaim the traditional knowledge local peoples have regarding animal populations relied on for their subsistence harvest needs when it serves their purpose in one area (i.e. the Porcupine Caribou herd), yet in a neighboring area will state that the knowledge of local peoples regarding predator and moose relationships are not accurate, based on largely on ignorance and do not deserve or should not be given credibility in management decisions; and

**WHEREAS:** It is further inconsistent for these same animal advocacy groups to play up support for subsistence harvest activities while filing legal challenges to the state's predator management programs, and actively advocating towards management practices that have historically shown and are known to cause depletion and long term/continued depletion of area moose populations; and

**WHEREAS:** There are 65 separately recognized moose populations in Alaska with 32 identified as important for providing "high levels of human consumptive (subsistence) use" [AS 16.055.255 (e)-(i)], of which 18 have been determined in decline since 2002. The Board of Game has only approved 5 predator management areas, mainly limited to Tier 1 subsistence hunting only. Yet animal welfare groups continue to misrepresent and/or mischaracterize these predator management programs as "excessive," or "being conducted for the sole benefit of sport and recreational hunting"; and

**WHEREAS:** An observation of the National Academy of Sciences report (Wolves, Bears, and Their Prey in Alaska contracted by the State from 1994-97) was that it was difficult to assess many of Alaska's predator management programs because they were consistently stopped (through political action/interference) within one to two years, rather than being conducted for their full durations (of up to 5 or more years) that were originally and scientifically deemed necessary; and

**WHEREAS:** A recent poll conducted by Dittman Research Inc. in August 2005, of villages in the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim, Yukon & Tanana River drainages asking if they felt their respective area supported the State of Alaska's efforts to control the number of predators found that 70% of the respondents stated they did (22% not in support, 8% unsure); and

**WHEREAS:** 60% of the respondents in this same poll, asked specifically about claims made by anti-hunting and animal welfare groups indicating that 70% of Alaskans were against the control of predator numbers, stated this did not reflect the majority views of people within their respective areas concerning this issue (25% stating it did, 15% unsure); and

**WHEREAS:** A common demographic grouping for those village residents who were opposed to predator management in this poll are 30-45 year old Caucasian females who arrived in bush Alaska some time in the last 10 years, who are overall most definitely not representative of long term participants, practices or concerns for subsistence harvest needs; and

RECEIVED TIME DEC 3 10:57AM

WHEREAS: An effort is again underway by conservation based and animal welfare organizational interests, with another petition drive to place the issue on the ballot of the next statewide election that would effectively stop the few predator management programs that are underway with the intent to prevent local residents or the state department of fish & game from utilizing these or similar programs as a viable management tool at any time in the future.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates to the 2005 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., that AFN stands in opposition to this ballot initiative to stop the state's few existing predator management programs, endorses efforts to rebuild and maintain Alaska's moose populations that includes predator management activities, and expresses support for the current Governor's fortitude to date supporting practical and proactive application of moose management through predator control programs, urging his continued determination for withstanding the pressures put forth by animal welfare organizations that oppose such activities to the detriment of Alaska's moose populations and the many Alaska residents who have traditionally depended upon them; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that AFN encourages Governor Murkowski to authorize and/or direct all appropriate administrative staff and departments such as Public Safety, Transportation, Commerce, Law, Fish & Game and Natural Resources, to work cooperatively with all affected entities including the legislature and congressional delegation towards the goals of rebuilding, maintaining and enhancing Alaska's moose populations to include state or federal actions that could help rectify the lack of understanding, consideration or accommodation at national societal levels for predator/prey management in Alaska that are conducive to providing priority for subsistence, reasonable opportunity and amounts necessary for related harvest needs; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that support resolutions, follow-up action and further development be pursued (in continued accordance with AFN's Tier 1 status in previous years of resolutions) through media sources and letters to opposing interests of predator management informing them of the harm, insensitivity, rejection and lack of accountability for providing for reasonable subsistence harvest opportunity, that their actions constitute as a major burden to the vast majority of rural Alaska residents, in addition to supportive efforts to address the issue through the state's administrative/legislative processes and/or congressional action.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS, SUBSISTENCE, TIER 1

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

1577 C Street, Suite 300, Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
907-274-3611 Fax 907-276-7989

December 2, 2005

The Honorable Frank Murkowski  
Office of the Governor  
State of Alaska  
P.O. Box 110001  
Juneau, AK 99811-0001

Via Fax: 907-465-3500

RE: Predator Management Programs - AFN Resolution 05-13

Dear Governor Murkowski:

On behalf of the Alaska Federation of Natives Board of Directors and the delegates to the AFN 2005 Convention, I am enclosing Resolution 05-13, passed at the 2005 AFN Convention in Fairbanks on October 22. Resolution 05-13 supports the State's efforts to rebuild, maintain and enhance Alaska's moose populations through its predator management programs and opposes ballot initiatives that would prevent the use of such programs.

The decline in moose populations, attributable to increased numbers of predator populations, has been of great concern to AFN and our member organizations for a number of years. There are 65 separately recognized moose populations in Alaska, with 32 identified as important for providing "high levels of human consumptive use," AS 16.055.255 (e)-(f), 18 of which have been in decline since 2002. The Board of Game has approved 5 predator management areas in response to these declines. Animal welfare groups argue that these predator management programs are "excessive" or are being conducted for the sole benefit of sport and recreational hunting. That is obviously not the case - moose are an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska.

As evidenced by a recent poll conducted by Dittman Research, Inc., in 2005, there is wide support within the villages in the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim, Yukon & Tanana River drainages for the State's predator control efforts. Yet, we understand there is another effort underway by animal welfare interests, to place a measure on the ballot in the next statewide election that would effectively halt the State's predator management efforts. We strongly oppose all such ballot initiatives and urge you and your Administration to withstand pressure from these groups to halt the State's predator management activities.

Finally, we request that you direct all appropriate administrative staff and department personnel to work cooperatively with all affected entities, the legislature and

RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

the Alaska congressional delegation to rebuild, maintain and enhance Alaska's moose populations.

Sincerely,

*Julie Kitka*  
Julie Kitka  
President

/chd

Enclosure (Resolution 05-13)

Cc: Senator Ben Stevens, Senate President, Alaska State Legislature  
Representative John Harris, Speaker of the House, Alaska State Legislature  
Representative Mary Kapsner, Chair, Bush Caucus  
McKie Campbell, Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Members of the Alaska Board of Game  
Senator Ted Stevens  
Senator Lisa Murkowski  
Congressman Don Young

RECEIVED TIME DEC 9 10:57AM

2004 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 04-09

- TITLE:** REQUESTING THE DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE AND OTHER CONSERVATION GROUPS DESIST IN ACTIVITIES DETRIMENTAL TO PROVIDING SUBSISTENCE NEEDS IN RURAL ALASKA
- WHEREAS:** In the last eight years since the ability to hold wolf populations at balanced levels conducive to moose survival was removed by ballot initiative, many moose populations throughout rural and bush Alaska have suffered declines of 50-70 %, despite the fact that mild winters, good habitat, and healthy birth rates prevailed; and
- WHEREAS:** The preponderance of existing and credible scientific information, long term professional observations, and overwhelming application of local/traditional ecological knowledge, reflects that increased predator populations are a key reason for these moose declines; and
- WHEREAS:** Predator management is a routine management activity to protect wild and domestic populations of prey species throughout the rest of the world and only in Alaska have such severe political strictures been imposed; and
- WHEREAS:** Unlike recent administrations, in the past year the current gubernatorial administration has declined to interfere or over-ride necessary management determinations of the State Board of Game and Division of Wildlife Conservations regarding this issue; and
- WHEREAS:** Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups has recently submitted a petition to the Secretary of Interior requesting Federal intervention to prevent the State from carrying out predator management activities to protect these moose populations; and
- WHEREAS:** Contrary to the assertions in this petition and related media releases, these activities are not being conducted for the sole benefit of sports hunters, but rather are predominantly applied only where Tier 1 or Tier 2 subsistence hunts have been enacted; and
- WHEREAS:** As reflected through resolutions at the 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 annual conventions of the Alaska Federations of Natives, maintaining abundant moose and caribou populations in rural Alaska is essential to providing for basic sustenance, current and future subsistence needs, as well as cultural health and well being of our people; and
- WHEREAS:** While we may appreciate the passion and zeal represented by those opposed to predator management activities, these activities had no direct effect on their families, and their removal poses significant harm and hardship to the pursuit of the subsistence way of life; and
- WHEREAS:** Within its website, Defenders of Wildlife criticizes the strategic wolf management plan developed through a stakeholder process in 1991 was bypassed for a more aggressive wolf control policy; and

WHEREAS: Predator management programs currently active within the state all fall directly within the guidelines and parameters laid out within the 1991 strategic wolf management plan; and

WHEREAS: There are 65 separately managed moose populations in Alaska of which 32 are identified as important for providing high levels of human consumptive use (subsistence), and as of the winter of 2002, 18 of these 32 populations were recognized as declining or decreasing; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Board of Game and Division of Wildlife Conservation have seen fit to conduct aggressive predator management on only 5 of these 18 populations, and in most areas, do so only within limited ranges or portions of the management units involved.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates to the 2004 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. asks the Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups to recognize a way of life different than that of mainstream America, take into account the effects of their actions on rural Alaska's subsistence needs, and share in the use and enjoyment of our resources by withdrawing their petition for Federal intervention to halt predator management programs in the State of Alaska; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that given the Defenders' repeated statements of supporting subsistence in Alaska, AFN asks that in the future this be more than verbal, by recognizing and accepting that providing for these subsistence needs may require actions which they may find uncomfortable or morally distasteful, but cause no substantial or direct physical hardship to their constituency, and that they support those people directly affected, and work to educate animal welfare groups throughout the nation on the realities of the situation, rather than pursuit of media sensationalism.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS, SUBSISTENCE, TIER 1

CONVENTION ACTION: AMENDED/PASSED



2003 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 03-08

- TITLE:** CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS BY THE STATE OF ALASKA TO MANAGE FOR SUSTAINED YIELD, SUBSISTENCE OPPORTUNITY, AND MAXIMUM USE OF ITS MOOSE POPULATIONS
- WHEREAS:** At annual conventions in 2000, 2001 and 2002 the Alaska Federation of Natives unanimously passed resolutions sponsored by AVCP, TCC, and BBNA stating extreme concern by its membership over increasing wolf numbers which threatened area moose populations that are of great importance in providing basic and primary sustenance to feed their families; and
- WHEREAS:** Many moose herds throughout the State of Alaska are either at seriously low levels, or are on a downward trajectory; and
- WHEREAS:** Existing scientific information, long term professional observation and the overwhelming opinion of resident observers point to rising predator numbers as a key reason for moose declines; and
- WHEREAS:** Since the ballot initiatives banning the public's ability to hold wolf populations in check to the present date, the State of Alaska has made no substantive or effective effort to address these concerns, while the people most directly affected continue to watch the problems steadily worsen, in some cases exceeding wolf population levels established by the state Board of Game by three to four fold; and
- WHEREAS:** Article VII, Sections 1 and 4 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska mandates that replenishable resources shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, and managed for maximum use subject to preference among beneficial uses; and
- WHEREAS:** Waiting until moose numbers in an area have been severely depleted by predation when available habitat is not a limiting factor, before even beginning to consider taking any predator control actions to reverse their decline is not managing for sustained yield, making this void of a historically effective management tool in direct conflict with Article VI Section 4 of the State's Constitution; and
- WHEREAS:** All beneficial uses of moose and wolf populations affected, consumptive and non-consumptive alike, are enhanced by achieving higher numbers of both species in the long term by maintaining a balance in their population levels through predator control, where without it, only the interests of primarily urban Alaskans whose lives are not directly affected by the question gain any benefit whatsoever, which raises further constitutional conflict under Sections 1, 3 and 17 of Article VIII; and
- WHEREAS:** Most every governmental or public task force, committee, commission or board convened to address the predator control issue has come to the conclusion or consensus that beyond any reasonable doubt, predator control is a necessary management action in one form or another to satisfactorily comply with the intent and purpose of providing for people's needs through sustained yield management; and
- WHEREAS:** It is hypocritical that the State of Alaska has taken such a strong and assertive role in adamantly refuting the assertions of state and national organizations opposed to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration for the aid of big business and (primarily urban) economic development interests, yet does not provide

an equivalent level of support in carrying out the same management tools to protect the subsistence needs of its people over large areas of the state, despite laws and regulations saying that subsistence is the highest beneficial use of our fish and game resources; and

WHEREAS: It is further highly inconsistent for the administration on the one hand to make every effort to regain full state control of subsistence management, while allowing a key subsistence resource such as moose to sink to very low population levels when management tools are available to prevent or reverse their declines; and

WHEREAS: If Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend Program suffered the same management inaction as moose populations over the last decade, annual dividend checks would be measured in pennies instead of dollars.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates to the 2003 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives directs to again call on the administration of the state of Alaska to immediately authorize and implement predator control programs throughout the state where they are needed to stabilize or reverse declines of moose populations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT failure to allow or conduct proactive and timely implementation of predator control programs by the State of Alaska to maintain historic moose population and harvest levels at high averages is in direct violation with their constitutional mandate to manage for sustained yield and maximum beneficial use, as well as being further inconsistent with other constitutional and statutory responsibilities recognizing subsistence as the highest beneficial use, among other management directives.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT since this issue has received unanimous support for resolutions regarding this problem for the last three years, that AFN leadership is directed to address the matter as a Tier 1 priority issue in its administrative agenda over the next year, or until such time as it is satisfactorily resolved.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: TIER 1, SUBSISTENCE, DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



2002 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 02-12

TITLE: WOLF PREDATION – PUBLIC SAFETY

WHEREAS: The wolf population is increasing at an alarming rate; and,

WHEREAS: Due to declining numbers of caribou and moose, wolves are now moving into villages and starting to attack pets and to use them for food; and,

WHEREAS: Rural CAP tried to address this problem by forming a state-wide group which advocated for allowing aerial wolf hunts in the McGrath area; and,

WHEREAS: Animal rights groups became involved and were able to sway the voters in Alaska by television and radio advertisements when the matter became an issue for the voters in Alaska to decide; and,

WHEREAS: Due to a decline in the food chain for the wolves, human lives may be in jeopardy; and,

WHEREAS: With wolves moving closer to villages, it is hampering berry picking and other subsistence activities.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESLOVED by the Delegates of the 2002 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. that, rather than going through normal procedures, that the matter be turned over to the Alaska Department of Public Safety and to use any means necessary including allowing aerial wolf hunts.

SUBMITTED BY: BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS TIER 2

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



2001 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 01-07

TITLE: WOLF PREDATION - PUBLIC SAFETY

- WHEREAS: The wolf population is increasing at an alarming rate; and,
- WHEREAS: Due to declining numbers of caribou and moose, wolves are now moving into villages and starting to attack pets and to use them for food; and,
- WHEREAS: Animal rights groups became involved and were able to sway the voters in Alaska by television and radio advertisements when the matter became an issue for the voters in Alaska to decide; and,
- WHEREAS: Due to a decline in the food chain for the wolves, they will start on humans for their food; and,
- WHEREAS: With wolves moving closer to villages, it is hampering berry picking and other subsistence activities.
- WHEREAS: Since 1995 to the present date the State of Alaska has made no substantive or effective effort to address these concerns, while the people directly affected continue to watch the problem steadily worsen; and
- WHEREAS: Article VIII, Section 4 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska mandates that replenish-able resources shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preference among beneficial uses; and
- WHEREAS: Waiting until moose and caribou numbers in an area have been severely depleted by predation when available habitat is not a limiting factor before even considering taking any predator control actions to reverse their decline is not managing for sustained yield, making this void of a historically effective management tool in direct conflict with Article VIII, Section 4 of the State's Constitution; and
- WHEREAS: Every known governmental or public task force, committee, commission or board convened to address the predator control issue has come to the conclusion or consensus that beyond any reasonable doubt, it is a necessary management action in one form or another to satisfactorily comply with the intent and purpose of providing for people's needs through sustained yield management; and
- WHEREAS: All beneficial uses of moose, caribou and wolf populations affected, consumptive and non-consumptive alike, are enhanced by maintaining

higher numbers of both species in maintaining - -  
population levels through predator control, where without it, only the  
narrow view of a small group of emotionally driven (primarily urban)  
Alaskans gain any substantive benefit whatsoever, which raises further  
constitutional conflict under Sections 3 and 17 of Article VIII; and

WHEREAS: It borders on the hypocritical that the State of Alaska has taken such a  
strong and assertive role in adamantly refuting the assertions of state and  
national organizations opposed to opening the Arctic National Wildlife  
Refuge to oil exploration for the aid of big business and (primarily urban)  
economic development interest, yet does not provide an equivocal level of  
support in standing up to these same types of organizations to protect the  
subsistence needs of its people over the vast majority of the State, in the  
face of laws and regulations saying that subsistence is the highest  
beneficial use of our fish and game resources.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates of the 2001 Annual  
Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives that the matter be turned  
over to the Alaska Department of Public Safety and to use any means  
necessary including allowing aerial wolf hunts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that failure to allow or conduct proactive and timely  
implementation of predator control programs by the State of Alaska to  
maintain historic moose and caribou population and harvest levels at high  
averages is in direct violation with their constitutional mandate to manage  
for sustained yield, as well as being further inconsistent with statutory and  
regulatory laws recognizing subsistence as the highest beneficial use,  
among other management directives.

SUBMITTED BY: Bristol Bay Native Association, Association of Village  
Council Presidents

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: AMENDED/PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

2000 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 00-47

TITLE: A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALASKA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO SUPPORT PREDATOR CONTROL

WHEREAS: At the March 2000 Board of Game meeting, the board decided unanimously to allow predator management where sound science found that there was an imbalance in the predator versus prey; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game should have been allowed to implement the predator management program with the biologist from ADF&G; and

WHEREAS: Further delay by the governor, in the carrying out of the predator control program, will have irreversible damage on the wildlife population; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates to the 2000 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. request the governor implement the predator control program that was approved by the Board of Game. Also, where in the areas it is too late for the balance of predator versus prey to recover, long-term studies are conducted so that this may not continue to happen in other areas.

SUBMITTED BY: Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc.

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



## 2007 ANNUAL CONVENTION

## RESOLUTION 07-15

**TITLE:** A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PREDATOR CONTROL AS A MEANS OF INCREASING GAME POPULATIONS

**WHEREAS:** The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game, allows predator control, including aerial or same-day airborne hunting of wolves, in limited circumstances in certain areas to enhance the population of moose and moose; and

**WHEREAS:** In some part of the state wolf predation is responsible for 80% of the mortality of moose and caribou that occurs in a year, and as a consequence the population of moose or caribou is far below what the habitat would support; and

**WHEREAS:** The state's predator control program, and all game regulations, are promulgated by the Alaska Board of Game through an extensive public process; and

**WHEREAS:** Moose and caribou are critical subsistence resources and are often the main protein source for many Alaska Native villages; and

**WHEREAS:** At the present time, Alaska's predator control program is limited to five wolf control programs encompassing less than 10% of the state; and

**WHEREAS:** Alaska's predator control program often comes under attack from Outside interest groups who may not fully understand the program, and recently legislation has been introduced in Congress that would completely ban the program.; and

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates to the 2007 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., that it supports limited predator control within the parameters established by the Alaska Board of Game, including aerial or same-day hunting of wolves, as a sound method of game management; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Delegates to the 2007 Annual Convention urges the Alaska Congressional Delegation to encourage public education on this matter and to resist any efforts in Congress to impose a federal ban on predator control in Alaska.

**SUBMITTED BY:** BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** DO PASS, TIER I

**CONVENTION ACTION:**

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES

2006 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 06-14

RESI

**TITLE:** REQUESTING DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE AND ALASKA WILDLIFE ALLIANCE TO WITHDRAW THEIR LAWSUIT TO STOP THE STATE OF ALASKA'S PREDATOR MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND CEASE MAKING INACCURATE PUBLIC STATEMENTS THAT THEIR OPINIONS REPRESENT "ALL THE PUBLIC INTERESTS" UNTIL THEY HAVE CONSULTED WITH, AND OBTAINED CONCURRENCE OR PERMISSION OF, ALL AFFECTED TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS ON THE ISSUE

**WHEREAS:** Alaska's Native community has repeatedly expressed its strong concerns, desire and support of predator management programs to be implemented in their respective areas to provide for basic subsistence needs through AFN Resolution Numbers 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08, 04-09 and 05-13 (reaffirmed and incorporated here be reference) that have passed the AFN Convention unanimously for the last six years; and

**WHEREAS:** Moose, an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska, have undergone significant declines of as much as 75-80% in many areas where long-term consistent human harvest and environmental conditions have not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge along with the most direct and credible scientific information available, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily due to increased numbers of predator populations since the ballot initiatives of 1996 and 2000 were fostered and imposed on the entire state by animal welfare organization proponents; and

**WHEREAS:** These concerns as expressed have become especially manifested in the Kuskokwim region where large customary and traditional subsistence use areas of former high moose numbers such as GMU 19A (which still retains highly productive but now unutilized habitat, high pregnancy and birth rates, but very poor calf survival or population recruitment), have been severely restricted to Tier II subsistence drawing hunts only, or closed completely to all subsistence hunting opportunity; and

**WHEREAS:** AFN Resolution #04-09 directly informed Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups critical of predator management programs in Alaska that their activities were hurtful at best and hostile at worst to providing for subsistence needs and requested that they work with the people most directly and negatively affected rather than against us; and

**WHEREAS:** To date there has been no known acknowledgement much less response to this request by Defenders or its affiliates in this matter, and instead our concerns have in essence been rejected with the filing of yet another "technical" legal challenge by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance to the State's few predator management programs on August 25, 2006, citing a lack of sufficient "scientific information" or "public support"; and

**WHEREAS:** Such actions either discount or completely disregard the "public support" for these programs and concerns for subsistence interests that are clearly stated in the AFN Resolutions referenced above or dismiss AFN's membership as a "public" whose interests and support is not worthwhile or worthy of consideration on this issue.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates of the 2006 Annual Convention believe that public statements and press releases made by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance in their current lawsuit that claim "predator management program decisions stem from individuals who have no regard for sound science, the will of the public and who have no long-term vision for the management of Alaska's natural heritage" are insensitive at best and insulting at worst to the long sought recognition and implementation of these programs by Alaska village residents; are against the best interests of providing for subsistence needs in Alaska's Native villages; and are in direct conflict with traditional environmental knowledge and other concerns expressed in the AFN resolutions for the past six years.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Delegates demand that unless the Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance do not wish to recognize Alaska Native villages or bush Alaska residents as having a legitimate public interest on this issue, they stop saying that their activities represent "all the public" until they have consulted with, and obtained documented permission of all affected Tribal organizations throughout the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim and Yukon River drainages, and other regions affected by this issue, and in the future they are requested to please have the courtesy, decency, integrity or accountability to make such statements accurately reflect that the public they represent is their own constituency - not everyone else and most certainly not ours!

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT by the Delegates that if Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance truly support Alaska's subsistence priority and reasonable subsistence harvest opportunity as they have publicly stated in the past, they would withdraw their lawsuit to stop the State of Alaska's predator management programs.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

2006 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 06-12

**TITLE: REASSERTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA'S RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE FOR AMOUNTS NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE, REASONABLE HARVEST OPPORTUNITY AND REGAIN COMPLIANCE WITH RELATED STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS**

**WHEREAS: Moose remain an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska, yet populations have undergone significant declines of 75-80% in many areas over the last decade where long-term consistent human harvest has not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge along with the most direct and credible scientific information available, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily attributable to increased numbers of predator populations since the early 1990's, when animal welfare proponents substantially elevated imposition of their opinions on the State through political manipulations; and**

**WHEREAS: The Association of Village Council Presidents, Bristol Bay Native Association and Tanana Chiefs Conference, have all expressed high levels of concern about this situation, repeatedly requesting that predator management programs be implemented in their respective areas through AFN Resolution #'s 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08, 04-09, and 05-13 (reaffirmed and incorporated here by reference) that have passed the Alaska Federation of Natives for the last six years; and**

**WHEREAS: A few existing predator management programs, some of which have been on the books for 15 years or more, have only recently been implemented or reactivated after their prohibition in the early 1990's, brought on through successful public manipulation by animal welfare groups that resulted in long-term lack of administrative support; and**

**WHEREAS: Efforts are being repeated by animal welfare advocates through another lawsuit filed in August, 2006, citing "a lack of sufficient scientific information" and the lack of "public support", to effectively stop the few predator management programs that are underway and prevent the state department of fish & game from utilizing these or similar programs as a viable management tool at any time in the future; and**

**WHEREAS:** Such statements discount or completely disregard the "public support", and concerns for subsistence interests that are clearly stated in the AFN Resolutions referenced above, or dismiss that membership as a "public" whose interests and support is not worthwhile or of lesser importance in this issue; and

**WHEREAS:** Despite statements from organizational representatives or others who make public claims to support predator management, but only if "it is based on sound science", it has become increasingly clear in recent decades that no amount of scientific information will ever be adequate to satisfy those groups or individuals who incorporate philosophical or moral superiority arguments into opposing predator management programs in bush Alaska, and who will simply continue to label any science as "good", "bad", or "insufficient" depending only upon whether they agree with those values and opinions – real applied "science" for most will have little bearing, regardless of source or merit; and

**WHEREAS:** A key observation of the National Academy of Sciences report (Wolves, Bears, and Their Prey in Alaska contracted by the State from 1994-97) was that it was difficult to assess many of Alaska's predator management programs because they were consistently stopped (mainly through political action/interference) within a few years rather than being conducted for the full duration (of up to 5 or more years) originally and scientifically deemed necessary; and

**WHEREAS:** Failure to actively incorporate and implement predator management programs as a basic management function undermines the state's subsistence priority law and related regulations governing the determination of amounts necessary for subsistence uses and providing a reasonable harvest opportunity; and

**WHEREAS:** Allowing moose populations to become depleted and remain at low levels violates the Alaska Constitution which mandates, among other things, principles of maximum use and benefit, common use, sustained yield, broad diversity of use, and uniform application for all those similarly situated regarding the subject matter at hand.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates to the 2006 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives that the Alaska Federation of Natives and member organizations are requested to consider intervening in the lawsuit filed by Defenders of Wildlife and Alaska Wildlife Alliance against the State of Alaska to halt predator management programs based on the opposing opinions of their "scientists" which are inconsistent with direct year-round local environmental knowledge and the opinions of area management biologists and, which in the past has resulted in the State of Alaska failing to manage for amounts necessary for subsistence and reasonable harvest opportunity, and to be out of compliance with at least 5 sections of Article VIII's constitutional standards and principles.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT in the future the critics of predator management programs should be required to provide conclusive scientific evidence that such programs are not effective in achieving their intended purposes, which are to increase the number of moose available for subsistence harvest, provide for a reasonable harvest opportunity and to comply with constitutional standards before predator management programs can be suspended or discontinued by political or administrative actions based on speculation, abstract scientific assertions, philosophical or social differences of opinion.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT AFN continue to actively follow-up on this resolution and further develop the issue in accordance with this and prior AFN Tier 1 resolutions.

SUBMITTED BY: ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES INC.

2005 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 05-13

**TITLE:** SUPPORT OF STATE ADMINISTRATION TO REBUILD, MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ALASKA'S MOOSE POPULATIONS AND OPPOSITION TO BALLOT INITIATIVES PREEMPTING EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO PROVIDE FOR REASONABLE SUBSISTENCE OPPORTUNITY

**WHEREAS:** Moose are an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska that have undergone significant declines of 75-80% in many areas over the last decade where long-term consistent human harvest has not been determined a major contributing factor, and according to the majority of local knowledge, the main driving influence on decreased moose numbers is primarily attributable to increased numbers of predator populations since the ballot initiatives of 1996 and 2000 were fostered and successfully imposed on the entire state by conservation and animal welfare constituencies; and

**WHEREAS:** The Association of Village Council Presidents, Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Bristol Bay Native Association, have all expressed high levels of concern about these population declines, repeatedly requesting that predator management programs be implemented in their respective areas through Resolution #'s 00-47, 01-07, 02-12, 03-08, 04-08 & 04-09 that have passed the Alaska Federation of Natives unanimously for the last five years. Ongoing concerns of concurrence have also been expressed by state and federal management support staff, affected Federal Regional Subsistence Councils, State Fish & Game Advisory Committees and Board of Game; and

**WHEREAS:** The Federal Subsistence Board has chosen to interpret through its Predator Management Policy that its "management" regime can only address the human harvest component of subsistence, and does not have authority to enact regulations, implement activities, or require programmatic agency response that would directly, substantively, effectively or actively manage populations such as moose and wolves even though predator control is a commonly approved practice, direct or sanctioned management action, conducted by federal agencies in several lower 48 states, as well as by governments in many other countries throughout the northern hemisphere; and

**WHEREAS:** Existing predator management programs in regulation, some of which have been in place for up to 15 years and/or more recently requested to be implemented by bush Alaska residents for years have only recently (in 2003) been allowed to be reactivated after a 10 year prohibition; and

RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

- WHEREAS: It is important to rural Alaska residents for environmental or animal welfare groups to acclaim the traditional knowledge local peoples have regarding animal populations relied on for their subsistence harvest needs when it serves their purpose in one area (i.e. the Porcupine Caribou herd), yet in a neighboring area will state that the knowledge of local peoples regarding predator and moose relationships are not accurate, based on largely on ignorance and do not deserve or should not be given credibility in management decisions; and
- WHEREAS: It is further inconsistent for these same animal advocacy groups to play up support for subsistence harvest activities while filing legal challenges to the state's predator management program and actively advocating towards management practices that have historically shown and are known to cause depletion and long term/continued depression of area moose populations; and
- WHEREAS: There are 65 separately recognized moose populations in Alaska with 32 identified as important for providing "high levels of human consumptive (subsistence) use" [AS 16.055.255 (e)-(i)], of which 18 have been determined in decline since 2002. The Board of Game has only approved 5 predator management areas, mainly limited to Tier 1 subsistence hunting only. Yet animal welfare groups continue to misrepresent and/or mischaracterize these predator management programs as "excessive," or "being conducted for the sole benefit of sport and recreational hunting"; and
- WHEREAS: An observation of the National Academy of Sciences report (Wolves, Bears, and Their Prey in Alaska contracted by the State from 1994-97) was that it was difficult to assess many of Alaska's predator management programs because they were consistently stopped (through political action/interference) within one to two years, rather than being conducted for their full durations (of up to 5 or more years) that were originally and scientifically deemed necessary; and
- WHEREAS: A recent poll conducted by Dittman Research Inc. in August 2005, of villages in the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim, Yukon & Tanana River drainages asking if they felt their respective area supported the State of Alaska's efforts to control the number of predators found that 70% of the respondents stated they did (22% not in support, 8% unsure); and
- WHEREAS: 60% of the respondents in this same poll, asked specifically about claims made by anti-hunting and animal welfare groups indicating that 70% of Alaskans were against the control of predator numbers, stated this did not reflect the majority views of people within their respective areas concerning this issue (25% stating it did, 15% unsure); and
- WHEREAS: A common demographic grouping for those village residents who were opposed to predator management in this poll are 30-45 year old Caucasian females who arrived in bush Alaska some time in the last 10 years, who are overall most definitely not representative of long term participants, practices or concerns for subsistence harvest needs; and

RECEIVED TIME DEC 9 10:57AM

**WHEREAS:** An effort is again underway by conservation based and animal welfare organizational interests, with another petition drive to place the issue on the ballot of the next statewide election that would effectively stop the few predator management programs that are underway with the intent to prevent local residents or the state department of fish & game from utilizing these or similar programs as a viable management tool at any time in the future.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the delegates to the 2005 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., that AFN stands in opposition to this ballot initiative to stop the state's few existing predator management programs, endorses efforts to rebuild and maintain Alaska's moose populations that includes predator management activities, and expresses support for the current Governor's fortitude to date supporting practical and proactive application of moose management through predator control programs, urging his continued determination for withstanding the pressures put forth by animal welfare organizations that oppose such activities to the detriment of Alaska's moose populations and the many Alaska residents who have traditionally depended upon them; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that AFN encourages Governor Murkowski to authorize and/or direct all appropriate administrative staff and departments such as Public Safety, Transportation, Commerce, Law, Fish & Game and Natural Resources, to work cooperatively with all affected entities including the legislature and congressional delegation towards the goals of rebuilding, maintaining and enhancing Alaska's moose populations to include state or federal actions that could help rectify the lack of understanding, consideration or accommodation at national societal levels for predator/prey management in Alaska that are conducive to providing priority for subsistence, reasonable opportunity and amounts necessary for related harvest needs; and

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED**, that support resolutions, follow-up action and further development be pursued (in continued accordance with AFN's Tier 1 status in previous years of resolutions) through media sources and letters to opposing interests of predator management informing them of the harm, insensitivity, rejection and lack of accountability for providing for reasonable subsistence harvest opportunity, that their actions constitute as a major burden to the vast majority of rural Alaska residents, in addition to supportive efforts to address the issue through the state's administrative/legislative processes and/or congressional action.

**SUBMITTED BY:** ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** DO PASS, SUBSISTENCE, TIER 1

**CONVENTION ACTION:** PASSED



RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

1577 C Street Suite 300, Anchorage, Alaska 99501

907-74-3611 Fax 907-276-7989

December 2, 2005

The Honorable Frank Murkowski  
Office of the Governor  
State of Alaska  
P.O. Box 110001  
Juneau, AK 99811-0001

Via Fax: 907-465-3500

RE: Predator Management Programs - AFN Resolution 05-13

Dear Governor Murkowski:

On behalf of the Alaska Federation of Natives Board of Directors and the delegates to the AFN 2005 Convention, I am enclosing Resolution 05-13, passed at the 2005 AFN Convention in Fairbanks on October 22. Resolution 05-13 supports the State's efforts to rebuild, maintain and enhance Alaska's moose populations through its predator management programs and opposes ballot initiatives that would prevent the use of such programs.

The decline in moose populations, attributable to increased numbers of predator populations, has been of great concern to AFN and our member organizations for a number of years. There are 65 separately recognized moose populations in Alaska, with 32 identified as important for providing "high levels of human consumptive use," AS 16.055.255 (e)-(f), 18 of which have been in decline since 2002. The Board of Game has approved 5 predator management areas in response to these declines. Animal welfare groups argue that these predator management programs are "excessive" or are being conducted for the sole benefit of sport and recreational hunting. That is obviously not the case - moose are an extremely important subsistence resource for people throughout Alaska.

As evidenced by a recent poll conducted by Dittman Research, Inc., in 2005, there is wide support within the villages in the Bristol Bay, Kuskokwim, Yukon & Tanana River drainages for the State's predator control efforts. Yet, we understand there is another effort underway by animal welfare interests, to place a measure on the ballot in the next statewide election that would effectively halt the State's predator management efforts. We strongly oppose all such ballot initiatives and urge you and your Administration to withstand pressure from these groups to halt the State's predator management activities.

Finally, we request that you direct all appropriate administrative staff and department personnel to work cooperatively with all affected entities, the legislature and

RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9. 10:57AM

the Alaska congressional delegation to rebuild, maintain and enhance Alaska's moose populations.

Sincerely,

*Julie Kitka*  
Julie Kitka  
President

/chd

Enclosure (Resolution 05-13):

Cc: Senator Ben Stevens, Senate President, Alaska State Legislature  
Representative John Harris, Speaker of the House, Alaska State Legislature  
Representative Mary Kapsner, Chair, Bush Caucus  
McKie Campbell, Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Members of the Alaska Board of Game  
Senator Ted Stevens  
Senator Lisa Murkowski  
Congressman Don Young

RECEIVED TIME DEC. 9 10:57AM

## 2004 ANNUAL CONVENTION

## RESOLUTION 04-09

- TITLE:** REQUESTING THE DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE AND OTHER CONSERVATION GROUPS DESIST IN ACTIVITIES DETRIMENTAL TO PROVIDING SUBSISTENCE NEEDS IN RURAL ALASKA
- WHEREAS:** In the last eight years since the ability to hold wolf populations at balanced levels conducive to moose survival was removed by ballot initiative, many moose populations throughout rural and bush Alaska have suffered declines of 50-70 %, despite the fact that mild winters, good habitat, and healthy birth rates prevailed; and
- WHEREAS:** The preponderance of existing and credible scientific information, long term professional observations, and overwhelming application of local/traditional ecological knowledge, reflects that increased predator populations are a key reason for these moose declines; and
- WHEREAS:** Predator management is a routine management activity to protect wild and domestic populations of prey species throughout the rest of the world and only in Alaska have such severe political strictures been imposed; and
- WHEREAS:** Unlike recent administrations, in the past year the current gubernatorial administration has declined to interfere or over-ride necessary management determinations of the State Board of Game and Division of Wildlife Conservations regarding this issue; and
- WHEREAS:** Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups has recently submitted a petition to the Secretary of Interior requesting Federal intervention to prevent the State from carrying out predator management activities to protect these moose populations; and
- WHEREAS:** Contrary to the assertions in this petition and related media releases, these activities are not being conducted for the sole benefit of sports hunters, but rather are predominantly applied only where Tier 1 or Tier 2 subsistence hunts have been enacted; and
- WHEREAS:** As reflected through resolutions at the 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 annual conventions of the Alaska Federations of Natives, maintaining abundant moose and caribou populations in rural Alaska is essential to providing for basic sustenance, current and future subsistence needs, as well as cultural health and well being of our people; and
- WHEREAS:** While we may appreciate the passion and zeal represented by those opposed to predator management activities, these activities had no direct effect on their families, and their removal poses significant harm and hardship to the pursuit of the subsistence way of life; and
- WHEREAS:** Within its website, Defencers of Wildlife criticizes the strategic wolf management plan developed through a stakeholder process in 1991 was bypassed for a more aggressive wolf control policy; and

F 17

**WHEREAS:** Predator management programs currently active within the state all fall directly within the guidelines and parameters laid out within the 1991 strategic wolf management plan; and

**WHEREAS:** There are 65 separately managed moose populations in Alaska of which 32 are identified as important for providing high levels of human consumptive use (subsistence), and as of the winter of 2002, 18 of these 32 populations were recognized as declining or decreasing; and

**WHEREAS:** The Alaska Board of Game and Division of Wildlife Conservation have seen fit to conduct aggressive predator management on only 5 of these 18 populations, and in most areas, do so only within limited ranges or portions of the management units involved.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the delegates to the 2004 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. asks the Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups to recognize a way of life different than that of mainstream America, take into account the effects of their actions on rural Alaska's subsistence needs, and share in the use and enjoyment of our resources by withdrawing their petition for Federal intervention to halt predator management programs in the State of Alaska, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that given the Defenders' repeated statements of supporting subsistence in Alaska, AFN asks that in the future this be more than verbal, by recognizing and accepting that providing for these subsistence needs may require actions which they may find uncomfortable or morally distasteful, but cause no substantial or direct physical hardship to their constituency, and that they support those people directly affected, and work to educate animal welfare groups throughout the nation on the realities of the situation, rather than pursuit of media sensationalism.

**SUBMITTED BY:** ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** DO PASS, SUBSISTENCE, TIER 1

**CONVENTION ACTION:** AMENDED/PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES

2003 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 03-08

**TITLE:** CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS BY THE STATE OF ALASKA TO MANAGE FOR SUSTAINED YIELD, SUBSISTENCE OPPORTUNITY, AND MAXIMUM USE OF ITS MOOSE POPULATIONS

**WHEREAS:** At annual conventions in 2000, 2001 and 2002 the Alaska Federation of Natives unanimously passed resolutions sponsored by AVCP, TCC, and BBNA stating extreme concern by its membership over increasing wolf numbers which threatened area moose populations that are of great importance in providing basic and primary sustenance to feed their families; and

**WHEREAS:** Many moose herds throughout the State of Alaska are either at seriously low levels, or are on a downward trajectory; and

**WHEREAS:** Existing scientific information, long term professional observation and the overwhelming opinion of resident observers point to rising predator numbers as a key reason for moose declines; and

**WHEREAS:** Since the ballot initiatives benning the public's ability to hold wolf populations in check to the present date, the State of Alaska has made no substantive or effective effort to address these concerns; while the people most directly affected continue to watch the problems steadily worsen, in some cases exceeding wolf population levels established by the state Board of Game by three to four fold; and

**WHEREAS:** Article VII, Sections 1 and 4 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska mandates that replenishable resources shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, and managed for maximum use subject to preference among beneficial uses; and

**WHEREAS:** Waiting until moose numbers in an area have been severely depleted by predation when available habitat is not a limiting factor, before even beginning to consider taking any predator control actions to reverse their decline is not managing for sustained yield, making this void of a historically effective management tool in direct conflict with Article VIII, Section 4 of the State's Constitution; and

**WHEREAS:** All beneficial uses of moose and wolf populations affected, consumptive and non-consumptive alike, are enhanced by achieving higher numbers of both species in the long term by maintaining a balance in their population levels through predator control, where without it, only the interests of primarily urban Alaskans whose lives are not directly affected by the question gain any benefit whatsoever, which raises further constitutional conflict under Sections 1, 3 and 17 of Article VIII; and

**WHEREAS:** Most every governmental or public task force, committee, commission or board convened to address the predator control issue has come to the conclusion or consensus that beyond any reasonable doubt, predator control is a necessary management action in one form or another to satisfactorily comply with the intent and purpose of providing for people's needs through sustained yield management; and

**WHEREAS:** It is hypocritical that the State of Alaska has taken such a strong and assertive role in adamantly refuting the assertions of state and national organizations opposed to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration for the aid of big business and (primarily urban) economic development interests, yet does not provide

an equivalent level of support in standing up to these same types of organizations to protect the subsistence needs of its people over large areas of the state, despite laws and regulations saying that subsistence is the highest beneficial use of our fish and game resources; and

**WHEREAS:** It is further highly inconsistent for the administration on the one hand to make every effort to regain full state control of subsistence management, while allowing a key subsistence resource such as moose to sink to very low population levels when management tools are available to prevent or reverse their declines; and

**WHEREAS:** If Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend Program suffered the same management inaction as moose populations over the last decade, annual dividend checks would be measured in pennies instead of dollars.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Delegates to the 2003 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives directs to again call on the administration of the state of Alaska to immediately authorize and implement predator control programs throughout the state where they are needed to stabilize or reverse declines of moose populations.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** failure to allow or conduct proactive and timely implementation of predator control programs by the State of Alaska to maintain historic moose population and harvest levels at high averages is in direct violation with their constitutional mandate to manage for sustained yield and maximum beneficial use, as well as being further inconsistent with other constitutional and statutory responsibilities recognizing subsistence as the highest beneficial use, among other management directives.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** since this issue has received unanimous support for resolutions regarding this problem for the last three years, that AFN leadership is directed to address the matter as a Tier 1 priority issue in its administrative agenda over the next year, or until such time as it is satisfactorily resolved.

**SUBMITTED BY:** ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** TIER 1, SUBSISTENCE, DO PASS

**CONVENTION ACTION:** PASSED



2002 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 02-12

TITLE: WOLF PREDATION – PUBLIC SAFETY

WHEREAS: The wolf population is increasing at an alarming rate; and,

WHEREAS: Due to declining numbers of caribou and moose, wolves are now moving into villages and starting to attack pets and to use them for food; and,

WHEREAS: Rural CAP tried to address this problem by forming a state-wide group which advocated for allowing aerial wolf hunts in the McGrath area; and,

WHEREAS: Animal rights groups became involved and were able to sway the voters in Alaska by television and radio advertisements when the matter became an issue for the voters in Alaska to decide; and,

WHEREAS: Due to a decline in the food chain for the wolves, human lives may be in jeopardy; and,

WHEREAS: With wolves moving closer to villages, it is hampering berry picking and other subsistence activities.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates of the 2002 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. that, rather than going through normal procedures, that the matter be turned over to the Alaska Department of Public Safety and to use any means necessary including allowing aerial wolf hunts.

SUBMITTED BY: BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS TIER 2

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



2001 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 01-07

TITLE: WOLF PREDATION - PUBLIC SAFETY

- WHEREAS: The wolf population is increasing at an alarming rate; and,
- WHEREAS: Due to declining numbers of caribou and moose, wolves are now moving into villages and starting to attack pets and to use them for food; and,
- WHEREAS: Animal rights groups became involved and were able to sway the voters in Alaska by television and radio advertisements when the matter became an issue for the voters in Alaska to decide; and,
- WHEREAS: Due to a decline in the food chain for the wolves, they will start on humans for their food; and,
- WHEREAS: With wolves moving closer to villages, it is hampering berry picking and other subsistence activities.
- WHEREAS: Since 1995 to the present date the State of Alaska has made no substantive or effective effort to address these concerns, while the people directly affected continue to watch the problem steadily worsen; and
- WHEREAS: Article VIII, Section 4 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska mandates that replenish-able resources shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preference among beneficial uses; and
- WHEREAS: Waiting until moose and caribou numbers in an area have been severely depleted by predation when available habitat is not a limiting factor before even considering taking any predator control actions to reverse their decline is not managing for sustained yield, making this void of a historically effective management tool in direct conflict with Article VIII, Section 4 of the State's Constitution; and
- WHEREAS: Every known governmental or public task force, committee, commission or board convened to address the predator control issue has come to the conclusion or consensus that beyond any reasonable doubt, it is a necessary management action in one form or another to satisfactorily comply with the intent and purpose of providing for people's needs through sustained yield management; and
- WHEREAS: All beneficial uses of moose, caribou and wolf populations affected, consumptive and non-consumptive alike, are enhanced by maintaining

higher numbers of both species in maintaining a balance in their population levels through predator control, where without it, only the narrow view of a small group of emotionally driven (primarily urban) Alaskans gain any substantive benefit whatsoever, which raises further constitutional conflict under Sections 3 and 17 of Article VIII; and

WHEREAS: It borders on the hypocritical that the State of Alaska has taken such a strong and assertive role in adamantly refuting the assertions of state and national organizations opposed to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration for the aid of big business and (primarily urban) economic development interest, yet does not provide an equivocal level of support in standing up to these same types of organizations to protect the subsistence needs of its people over the vast majority of the State, in the face of laws and regulations saying that subsistence is the highest beneficial use of our fish and game resources.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates of the 2001 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives that the matter be turned over to the Alaska Department of Public Safety and to use any means necessary including allowing aerial wolf hunts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that failure to allow or conduct proactive and timely implementation of predator control programs by the State of Alaska to maintain historic moose and caribou population and harvest levels at high averages is in direct violation with their constitutional mandate to manage for sustained yield, as well as being further inconsistent with statutory and regulatory laws recognizing subsistence as the highest beneficial use, among other management directives.

SUBMITTED BY: Bristol Bay Native Association, Association of Village Council Presidents

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: AMENDED/PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC.

2000 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 00-47

TITLE: A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALASKA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO SUPPORT PREDATOR CONTROL

WHEREAS: At the March 2000 Board of Game meeting, the board decided unanimously to allow predator management where sound science found that there was an imbalance in the predator versus prey; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game should have been allowed to implement the predator management program with the biologist from ADF&G; and

WHEREAS: Further delay by the governor, in the carrying out of the predator control program, will have irreversible damage on the wildlife population; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates to the 2000 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. request the governor implement the predator control program that was approved by the Board of Game. Also, where in the areas it is too late for the balance of predator versus prey to recover, long-term studies are conducted so that this may not continue to happen in other areas.

SUBMITTED BY: Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc.

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS

CONVENTION ACTION: PASSED



ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES

2007 ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION 07-15

TITLE: A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PREDATOR CONTROL AS A MEANS OF INCREASING GAME POPULATIONS

WHEREAS: The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game, allows predator control, including aerial or same-day airborne hunting of wolves, in limited circumstances in certain areas to enhance the population of moose and moose; and

WHEREAS: In some part of the state wolf predation is responsible for 80% of the mortality of moose and caribou that occurs in a year, and as a consequence the population of moose or caribou is far below what the habitat would support; and

WHEREAS: The state's predator control program, and all game regulations, are promulgated by the Alaska Board of Game through an extensive public process; and

WHEREAS: Moose and caribou are critical subsistence resources and are often the main protein source for many Alaska Native villages; and

WHEREAS: At the present time, Alaska's predator control program is limited to five wolf control programs encompassing less than 10% of the state; and

WHEREAS: Alaska's predator control program often comes under attack from Outside interest groups who may not fully understand the program, and recently legislation has been introduced in Congress that would completely ban the program.; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Delegates to the 2007 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., that it supports limited predator control within the parameters established by the Alaska Board of Game, including aerial or same-day hunting of wolves, as a sound method of game management; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Delegates to the 2007 Annual Convention urges the Alaska Congressional Delegation to encourage public education on this matter and to resist any efforts in Congress to impose a federal ban on predator control in Alaska.

SUBMITTED BY: BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS, TIER I

CONVENTION ACTION:



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resources Committee  
committee name  
committee on HB No. 256, dated 5/11/07  
bill/subject

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Testifier

*Joan Andersen*  
Joan Andersen

No affiliation

Representing (Optional)

1110 W. 6th Avenue, #503, Anchorage, AK 99501

Address

907-279-4024

Phone No.

My name is Joan Andersen and I have lived in Anchorage since 1983. I am not affiliated with any group or organization. I wanted to testify in person today (1/29/08), but time ran out for public testimony on this bill.

I strongly oppose passage of HB 256. This bill if implemented, could lead to the elimination of predators from Alaska. The Lower 48 eliminated wolves and other predators years ago, and as a result, many states have an excessive number of deer and other ungulates, and unhealthy ecosystems. Lyme disease in humans (caused by deer ticks) is a direct result of the over population of deer in the Lower 48.

I was at the meeting of the Board of Game last weekend, and one prominent board member referred to animals in the wild as "critters." This term says it all. It diminishes the importance of animals to zero. Animals do not count in the collective mind of the supporters of this bill; only the interests of humans count.

The same can be said for the use of the term "harvesting" wolves. What is being done under HB 256, and the original law, is not "harvesting" wolves, as you would "harvest" a crop of wheat, but rather "killing" wolves. I believe the term "harvesting" has been deliberately used so that the public views predators as inanimate objects or things and thus the public is less emotional about the issue of same-day aerial hunting of wolves and other predators.

I also believe this bill is up for passage because the wealthy, powerful interests which include monied, out-of-state hunters, wish to bag moose and caribou in as easy a manner as possible, which happens when ungulates are unnaturally increased due to the elimination of predators. These monied interests support members of the legislature and Board of Game, and thus supporters of this bill are only too happy to accommodate the desires of the rich and powerful hunters and hunting organizations to the detriment of the majority of the State's residents.

The revisions to the old law, which was bad enough already, would in my opinion not be up for consideration if subsistence hunters were the backers. The natives and rural residents, who may really need the meat caribou and moose provide, are not responsible for this bill. The monied hunters only hunt for sport, and not to put meat on the table, but they have the voice that is listened to, and they are responsible for the new bill. This situation is not acceptable to a public which loves Alaska for its wildlife and natural viewing opportunities, including viewing wolves and bears.

This new bill only worsens an already out-of-kilter ecosystem caused by the original aerial hunting statute. Passage of the new bill would further erode Alaska's ecosystems and the balance between prey and predators. It is completely unnecessary, and bottom line, it will prove harmful to the State of Alaska. Please do not pass HB 256.

## House Bill 256 Would Eliminate Any Science Oversight of the Alaska Predator Control Program!

On Jan. 30, 2:00 PM, the Juneau House Resources Committee will consider legislation that would open the doors to greatly increased killing of wolves, bears and wolverines statewide, without necessity or requirement to consider scientific rationale behind such action. This legislation, HB 256, would also eliminate analysis or review from the Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game for such increased predator control. A similar piece of legislation has been introduced in the Senate (Senate Bill 176).

A video link will be provided at the Legislative Information Office, 716 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Anchorage. The public is welcome to attend and to speak regarding HB 256 (sign up by 1:00PM).

HB 256 is expected to:

- Make a bad law worse, giving the Board of Game a completely free hand to control predators.
- Expand Alaska's already excessive, expensive predator control programs and pave the way for the Board of Game to increase this unnecessary killing by leaving decisions up to this Board.
- Destroy the intention of the voter-enacted ban on the same-day airborne shooting of wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines, making it much easier to increase the aerial killing of these animals.
- Add brown bears and wolverines to the list of species that may be shot by aerial gunners.
- Permit the use of airplanes to track and shoot down wolves, grizzly bears and wolverines without requiring any comprehensive "game management plan" to be placed beforehand.

This proposed legislation is not scientifically defensible -- it would undermine balanced management of the wildlife belonging to all Alaskans!

Contact: Citizens Concerned for Alaska Wildlife  
[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/alaska\\_wildlife](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/alaska_wildlife)  
907-274-5933

Mr. Tom Banks  
Alaska Field Representative, Defenders of Wildlife  
[tbanks@defenders.org](mailto:tbanks@defenders.org)  
907-276-9410