

November 12, 2017

Milena Sevigny  
PO Box 875708  
Wasilla, AK 99687

Dear Board of Game,

I am opposed to Proposition 64. If passed the proposal would remove my right of access to a local food source that my family depends on and the expenditure of more tax dollars to enforce the Proposition is unreasonable considering the fiscal crisis the State of Alaska is currently under. Let me explain.

If passed, the Proposal would remove domestic goats and sheep from the "Clean List" of animals requiring permits to keep livestock on private lands. Effectively this would put sheep and goat owners in a state of engaging in illegal activity. According to the Alaska Fish & Game Department website *"If a particular mammal, bird, or reptile species does not appear on this list, it may not be imported into Alaska or possessed as a pet or livestock in Alaska, and the Department of Fish and Game cannot issue a permit allowing its importation or possession."* <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=pets.exotic>. In order put sheep and goat farmers in compliance with this regulation as it is currently written an amendment or change would need to take place, which would take time and money.

In multiple public documents and news articles the Wild Sheep and Goat Foundation has offered to pay for the cost of testing. According to the Alaska Dispatch News recent article on November 9<sup>th</sup> "Kehoe said, the group did discuss what the foundation views as an alternative proposal that would involve testing sheep and goats to make sure they were free of bacteria and replacing ones that tested positive. He said the foundation would pay the cost of testing, which he said could cost half a million dollars." Yet all the costs to date have been borne by the Office of the State Vet, Farm Bureau, and participating farmers with no mention of strings or conditions attached. The Alaska Dispatch News presents a picture with a seemingly generous offer from the Wild Sheep & Goat Foundation. However, as was stated in the Alaska Wild Sheep Foundation presentation to the Summit in April of 2017 the story changed and strings were attached. Referring to the presentation "Our position is we will CONSIDER paying for statistical testing to determine prevalence of disease." Again another example of costs that will be required if Prop 64 is passed.

Another major concern I have is that if Prop 64 passed and goat and sheep farmers would no longer be able to raise their animals in the state and that would remove a local food source of dairy products and in some cases meat. The State of Alaska has an average of 2-3 days of food supply on hand. The Port of Anchorage brings in 85% of the goods that come up to the State of Alaska. In the event of a disaster the State would be cut off from food supply for longer than 2-3 days. I work at the Port of Anchorage and have seen 2 cases since 2015 where food supply was interrupted. First time in winter of 2015, one ship was late delivering goods to the Port of

Anchorage and multiple stores ran out of food. Another time in winter of 2016, one truck delivering groceries to a store in Wasilla slid off the road, again interrupting the supply of food to the store. The photos below were taken at that grocery store in 2016 that the truck was delivering food to. Again, solid examples of our delicate balance here in Alaska to maintain enough food supply for those who live here.



I ask you Ladies and Gentlemen, which department is going to take on the task of enforcing this new regulation? Whose budget would fund the enforcement (issuing permits, ensuring compliance to this law, testing animals)? What would be the penalty for non-compliance and would this penalty even be legal?

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Milena Sevigny