

## **PROPOSAL 77**

### **5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep.**

Reopen Unit 19C to sheep hunting as follows:

The Board should rescind Proposal 204 as passed in Soldotna.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Board erred greatly by passing Proposal 204 as amended from the last Board of Game meeting in Soldotna.

I urge the board to rescind its actions on Proposal 204 which was “faulty” on several fronts. Here are a few of the elements which were disregarded:

#### **Board-Generated Proposals**

The Board should be receiving proposals from the public, not creating its own proposals that it then passes. This action essentially supersedes the rights of the public and appears to be a conflict of interest since the board can hardly be unbiased as to its very own proposal.

#### **Conservation to Discrimination**

The drafting of board-generated Proposal 204, based on emotion and not facts, was written as a self-perceived rescue operation for the sheep of Unit 19C by precluding all hunting for five years. This is so outlandish it clearly has absolutely no basis in fact for its creation, either for the duration or the severity of the proposal. But somewhere along the chronology of the discussion, the conservation motive was cast aside for an arbitrary and capricious substitute precluding only nonresident sheep hunting. There was no legitimate reason to discriminate against nonresidents.

#### **Board of Game Usurps the Commissioner’s Authority to Manage**

We can see the first duty of the Commissioner in statute is to manage. So why did the board step in and presume to do so by creating Proposal 204? If there really was a conservation concern, the Commissioner could at any time create an emergency order to modify the harvest. But there wasn’t a conservation concern on the part of the real manager to justify the board’s actions, therefore the Board overstepped its bounds in creating and passing Proposal 204.

#### **Ignores the Economic Wellbeing of the State per AS 16.05.020**

In sheep hunting across the state, if you don’t include the sale of Governor’s tags, nonresident sheep hunters contribute about 86% of the sheep hunting revenue that goes to the Fish and Game Fund. Residents contribute 14%. Historically in Unit 19C nonresident hunters contribute 95% of sheep hunter funds going into the Fish and Game Fund. So if the statutes require, in the decisions about how wildlife should be managed, that the “general wellbeing of the economy” be given credence, under what mathematical system would the board exclude the users who pay 95% of sheep hunter revenue in Unit 19C? Before the current weather mediated lower sheep numbers, equal numbers of resident and nonresidents hunted in that unit each year. With the Pittman-Robertson match residents on average over five years brought to the Fish and Game Fund \$18,000 per year while nonresidents contributed \$367,000 annually. Failing to consider the importance of the economic implications of the final outcome of the board’s decision, precluding nonresidents is clearly nothing short of a grievous fiscal error on the part of the board.

#### **Ignores the October Department Sheep Report**

In October the board called on the department for a “state of sheep” report. Department staff gave a wonderful and detailed report, and in so doing said straight out the decline in sheep numbers, where they occur, are weather-driven, AND there is NO CONSERVATION CONCERN. The board apparently failed to hear what everyone else heard from these dedicated department sheep biologists. But the department again sent the same message to the board at the recent Board of Game meeting, and the board appeared to have not heard it. It would be inappropriate if this occurred because the board was so invested in their own proposal (read conflict of interest) that they once more ignored what the experts had to say and acted in contrary to the data provided them (twice). Indeed, if there is no conservation concern as stated by the managers (the department), why did the board act so egregiously by taking matters into its own hands thinking they had the data and scientific knowledge greater than that of the department’s experts?

#### Ignores the Protective Nature of Full Curl

It is widely known and accepted by biologists who have been in the business for several decades that a full curl harvest regime is helpful to the population as a whole in that only the surplus mature rams are harvested. The father of sheep biology, having proved the benefits of full curl, and this work was retested on Dall sheep<sup>1</sup>, Testimony was given to the Board of Game that this regime is the most protective to sheep while also keeping the young rams from over stressing at breeding time and wearing themselves out trying to copulate as they would without the presence of mature rams to disincentivize them from acting out. Oddly, in Units 7 and 15 where the sheep situation is much worse off than that in Unit 19C, the board just let full curl ride, but in Unit 19C, a lesser affected area, the board went straight to not letting full curl do its job and instead did the irrational thing by precluding hunters when there was no reason to.

#### Going Emotional Instead of Relying on The Science

I was told that a retired trooper in the hopes of precluding any sheep hunting in Unit 19C (where his son got a 42” ram a couple years ago) was saying if there are no rams to break trail in the snow for the lambs, the latter would die. If it is true, this story got any traction at all it is a fanciful fabrication. Lambs don’t hang out with rams. They stay with their mothers who don’t hang out with the rams either. The board must base its decisions on truth and data as shared by the department’s experts, not on emotional tales invented to elicit an emotional response.

#### Ignores the Adaptability of Sheep

Sheep have been in Alaska for thousands of years. And in those years there surely must have been fluctuations in population numbers. We know that parts of Alaska experienced both tropical epochs followed by deep glaciation. Sheep are adaptable. They have probably suffered much worse than things are now in Unit 19C, or even Units 7 and 15. They will be fine. The current low numbers are due to weather events, and they will rebound. Until then there is no reason or any scientific basis to curtail any hunting at this time.

So please rescind what was passed for all the wrong reasons of Proposal 204.

Thank you very much.

<sup>1</sup>The author provided names of individuals which were redacted as a matter of proposal policy.

**PROPOSED BY: Karen Gordon**

**(EG-F23-315)**

\*\*\*\*\*