

Dear Board and Game,

This letter is my objection to reinstate the program outlined in Proposal 21 involving the indiscriminate aerial gunning of brown bears in GMU 17. The decision had already been ruled against in court considering the initial implementation had been ruled as unconstitutional for the way in which it was forced through. Due to this, allowing this program to continue would clearly state that government officials are above the laws and process of which every person they represent is expected to follow. This would also set a precedent that public comment, along with the will of the people, matter less than the individual desire of those in government to make major wildlife management decisions which effect a broad range of people as well.

In addition to the due process violations of this proposal, the science surrounding this project has seemed rushed and without care. Not once have I seen a study conducted to understand approximately how many brown bears are in the target area, how severely caribou calf predation is, nor a realistic quota of brown bears to remove in order to balance caribou calf survival as well as bear populations. The fact that the states goal is simply to go out and kill as many brown bears as possible is a management style suited for feral pigs in texas, not one of Alaska's most coveted game animals. Also, the state suggests that moose populations are increasing in unit 17, so my question is how can the brown bears be so detrimental to caribou and not moose? It is naive to think that bears do not prey upon both, but to the

level that they need to be culled by the state is an exaggeration and overcorrection.

Lastly, in terms of finances, the state is spending millions on a project most people don't even want, in order to kill an animal that requires a \$1000 non-resident tag and mandatory guide, which brings \$20,000-30,000 of business to the state. Same day airbourne was proposed for outfitters, which was ruled against. If the state really wanted more bears removed, they would have allowed this, which would have aided in their goal, and allowed outfits generating money for the state to help with what the state views as a problem. The fact that the state would rather spend tax payer money while negatively affecting the businesses in the region relying on healthy brown bear

populations is not a good way to get people to support reasonable state actions in the future.

Overall, there are a wide range of reasons as to why the unit 17 brown bear culling program should not continue. By all legal, scientific, economic and public appearance considerations I do not see a way in which this program could be considered a good thing. I hope my points are considered in keeping this proposal from being reinstated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Zach Basmajian