



FROM JEFF JUDD. NOVEMBER 11, 2017

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Ms. Tibbles,

My name is Jeff Judd. 57 years old, an Alaskan resident since 1966. I grew up hunting with my father and have hunted moose and caribou most of my life, including with my wife and her family. My wife, Tina, and I grew up in Anchorage and moved out to the Mat-Su Valley about 25 years ago, wanting to have a small farm. We have had horses and mules, pigs, cows, chickens, geese, and goats. Mostly goats.

In 25 years we have never seen a wild goat on or anywhere near our property. In fact, I googled Sheep in Wasilla, Alaska, and not a single story came up about a wild sheep running around Wasilla. Not one. And the thing is, we are never going to see a wild sheep on our property. It's just too far out of their habitat area and there are too many barriers between our place and where wild sheep live.

Proposal 64 as worded is legally ill conceived: By removing an animal from the Clean List, those animals become simply illegal to own in the State of Alaska. The AAC pertaining to the Clean List says that once removed from the Clean List a permit "can not" be issued.

Proposing that they be removed from the Clean List but then be permitted is inconsistent with the AAC.

The Proposal establishes parameters under which persons may be able to own domestic goats or sheep, including double fencing (10') and mandatory testing if within 15 miles of Wild Sheep habitat.

- The WSF purports that such requirements are absolutely necessary and are of little consequence to the domestic community. This is simply untrue. Building double fencing, at the height they have demanded, is extremely expensive. Most domestic owners do have the capability to fund such an expense. And it should not be required in areas where it is highly unlikely that a Dall sheep will ever actually be.
- They purport to pay for testing, yet to date they have not done so – even though Dr. Gerlach indicated yesterday he would have like to have done additional testing but his Department budget had run out of money to do so. Where is the WSF's commitment to help fund testing? They condition their funding on mandatory testing requirements and destruction of any animal that tests positive. That's not working together and not constructive at this point in time.
- They suggest they'll pay for replacement of the animal, yet don't provide any specifics of how they would do this, the conditions under which they would do this, the permanency of such a commitment, or establishment of an animal's value. Publicly they have said that domestic animals are worth about \$200, yet dairy goats with good genetics and production credentials can be valued well over \$1,000.

Even more importantly, the requirements that are established in Proposal 64 even if a permit could be issued once removed from the Clean List are simply overkill and unnecessary in most areas of the State.

- We do not have the same conditions that exist in the lower 48.
- We do not have open grazing on public lands here in Alaska.

- We have natural barriers and wild predators that tend to keep wild sheep within their habitat areas.
- We already restrict goat use in the backcountry for hunting purposes.
- Yes, on rare occasion we have seen wild sheep or wild goats ranging out of the mountainous habitat – aka the goat that stopped by McDonalds in Palmer last year. **But in those rare cases would it not be a more balanced approach to simply dispatch that wild animal if there was a concern about co-mingling with a domestic animal rather than impose prohibitive and costly requirements on thousands of Alaskan residents that own domestic goats and sheep.**

USDA Scientist Maggie Hyland has completed years of scientific study into this issue related to Movi. She has consulted with Dr. Gerlach and the ADF&G on this issue and her public conclusion is that there is no proven significant risk to Alaska's Wild Dall Sheep of exposure to Movi, and that Proposal 64 was unnecessary and a significant overreach.

So where does this leave us?

- As of yet there does not seem to be a scientifically based conclusion in Alaska that warrants the extreme measures that are proposed in Prop 64
- There are unanswered legal questions regarding what the consequence is of removing a domestic animal off the Clean List. These need to be solidly resolved and communicated to the public well in advance of some action to be taken by this governing body.
- We should let ADEC and the State Vet's Office complete their risk assessment of this issue.
- This body should direct the ADF&G to do what they said they would do well over a year ago, but have not done due to internal conflict within the

Department as stated by Department officials. Complete a detailed mapping of critical Dall Sheep Habitat Areas so that if there is to be regulatory parameters around ownership of domestic goats and sheep, that we frame those requirements around the identifiable high risk areas, not 15 mile swaths around every Mountain in Alaska.

- If it eventually determined through a risk assessment that some reasonable regulatory restrictions might be appropriate, let the responsible State Agency, ADEC develop those regulations.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

1. ADEC can develop regulations requiring testing for Movi for all future imports of sheep and goats.
2. If the risk assessment finds it appropriate perhaps require testing and appropriate fencing in areas of critical concern – areas immediately within where Dall sheep actually live (mountainous areas like Cooper Landing, Copper Center, etc., not the entire Mat-Su Valley, Anchorage metropolitan areas, etc.
3. Dispatch wild sheep that roam into urbanized environments if there really is a concern. The killing on an occasional Dall sheep or goat in such cases is inconsequential to the Wild sheep population as compared to the 800 or so wild sheep that are killed by hunters annually.
4. Restrict domestic goats and sheep from entering the back country without having completed Movi free testing.

There are things we can do together if we just work together and do so based on science and a risk assessment completion. We don't need passage of Proposal 64 to accomplish those goals if this body would simply direct the WSF to allow the State Vet to complete the risk assessment, and based on that to

develop an appropriate and balanced approach to any legitimate concerns, as contrasted with one-sided, and unbalanced approach that is proposed in Proposal 64.

