Board of Games Comments Alaska Dept of Fish & Game Boards Support Section P.O. Box 115526 Juneau, AK 99811-5526



Dec 27, 2012

SUPPORTING PROPOSALS 18, 19, 20

1) Proposal 18 & 19

Alaska's already enormously deteriorated reputation on unscientific, inhumane, unethical management of wildlife should be a prime concern for the decisions made by the BOG. In today's era our knowledge and concerns for a healthy wildlife ecosystem should be the major driving factor in your decision making process.

Bear snaring is not only an indiscriminate method of killing adult bear and cubs, males, females and is totally unethical, unscientific and totally flawed not to mention enormously cruel and savage.

This poses unsafe conditions for those travelling through the land who can inadvertently come across a sow protecting her snared cub.

There is a large group of environmentally minded individuals world-wide that look to the wilderness as something very special and irreplaceable, who want to enjoy the wilderness as is and who respect and want to view wildlife. I visited Alaska this year for that very reason for the sole purpose of seeing the natural beauty and wildlife that this land has to offer. Your state benefits from these tourism dollars.

Bear snaring is despicable and should be totally banned. It can destroy two successive generations at once and leaves animals suffering unnecessarily for a long time. This is a completely unacceptable practice.

2) Proposal 20

There should be consistency in the hunting/trapping regulations. As far as I am concerned no wolves should be killed. They are required

as the apex predator to manage a healthy ecosystem. These animals are intelligent and require the support of the pack to

reproduce and maintain a healthy wolf pack. Hence any killing that impacts the pregnant females and the nurturing of young pups is not only wrong but despicable, inhumane, cruel, insensitive, unethical and ecologically and scientifically unsound.

The indiscriminate hunting and trapping that can destroy two generations at once is absolutely despicable. No wolves should be killed between March 1 and Nov 1. As far as I am concerned no wolves should be killed at all.

Your efforts should be geared towards appreciating the wildlife that lives within your state boundaries. Use the time to learn and educate yourselves on how intricate and wonderful the wolf really is and share this knowledge with the rest of the world.

Your methods are scientifically flawed as pups that do not survive are not counted meaning that a substantial number of wolves are lost that are reflected in the harvest statistics.

3) Denali Buffer Zone - RESCIND THE MORATORIUM

We ask that the BOG to RESCIND ITS MORATORIUM on accepting proposals related to Denali national park no-trapping zones.

The BOG has NO RIGHT to limit the public process.

The BOG has a statutory mandate to consider any reasonable proposal from the public relating to wildlife management. A buffer Zone for the Denali wolves is such a proposal. A moratorium on Denali buffer proposals should not be used as a way to stifle those it does not agree with.

When the BOG refuses to accept proposals on any given wildlife management situation, it losses the opportunity to hear new and relevant information about wildlife management. This would allow the management of wildlife with the best sound knowledge and information available.

The BOG should strongly consider reinstating the buffer zone around the boundaries of Denali Park to ensure that <u>all</u> its wildlife is protected especially when apex predators leave the confines of the park.

Regards

Eva Schorer

7204 Concession 1
Puslinch, Ontario

Canada

NOB 2J0

519.763.0997

Board of Game Comments Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game Boards Support Section PO Box 115526 Juneau, Alaska 99811 -5526



Dec 27, 2012

ATTN: Board of Game Comments

>1 am totally opposed to this unscientific, blatantly ignorant and expensive wolf killing "experiment" on the Alexander Archipelago wolves!

It is shocking to hear that in this day and age wildlife management can act based on " management experiment" guise rather than scientific, knowledgeable and ethical protocol in making good and sound decisions.

Jumping to any conclusion based on incomplete data is absurd.

The decline of a species such as the Sitka Black-tailed Deer population is not due to wolf predation nor bear predation. If that was the case the deer species would have been extinct many eons ago before the arrival of man. Nature has evolved to keep species in a healthy balance. It is man that upsets the natural ecosystem balance such as clear-cut logging and habitat destructions of old-growth forests.

Consequently it is totally irresponsible and stupid to jump to any conclusion that is unfounded to blatantly kill wildlife.

It would be in everyone's interest to be responsible and make logical decisions based on fact ..rather than fiction... as follows:

Note that it is the destruction of the old growth forest by MAN that has negatively impacted the population of the Sitka deer and wolf population.

>Severe winter weather with deep snow coverage in the last 3 years has impacted Unit 1A. The study stated that "severe winter weather is believed to have had the greatest impact on Unit 1A deer populations, resulting in the high rates of mortality"

The Unit 1A study states that "we have no research information to accurately estimate wolf...numbers on Gravina Island." The Unit 3 study states that wolf population counts are not even feasible there. ADF&G is equally unsure how many black bears are in either Unit, and it does not even know how many deer there are. The science is clearly lacking to support any predator control measures.

>ADF&G's preliminary estimates indicate the basic cost for just the predator control program and related deer population studies will be more than \$200,000 per year for five years. In these times of austere budgets, there is certainly a better use for more than a million dollars of state money than to provide easier targets for a small number of deer hunters. Especially since, given the many other factors involved, it seems very unlikely the predator control program will actually result in more deer. These approaches have been proven time and time again not to work.

>The studies do not address effects of fewer wolves on the wildlife tourism industry, which benefits local economies when visitors come to catch a glimpse of the rare wolf. Neither do they address the loss of wolf viewing opportunities for non-consumptive users, such as hikers and photographers, wildlife enthusiasts and observers.

When are we going to start taking intelligent, logical scientifically sound decisions to preserve this wonderful wilderness.

Regards

Eva Schorer

7204 Concession 1 Puslinch, Ontario

Canada

NOB 2JO

519,763,0997