

RC071

Re: Proposition 90

I oppose this Proposition on many levels – most of all emotional. But let me try and be brief and logical.

- 1.) Passing this Proposal 90 as written leaves issues and requirements unanswered.
 - a. While you have the authority to remove animals from the “clean list”, permitting is not allowed for - under your authority or provisions – unless you change the definition of the clean list.
 - b. 15 air miles is broad – what is the basis of the distance and which areas would or could be defined as sheep habitat. This is not specified within the proposal.
 - c. What testing is to be done on each animal? This is not specified within the proposal.
 - d. Who is to cover the cost of the “required” testing?
 - i. I spend already \$28 per goat for testing per year, for diseases my community and I have concerns.
 - ii. What about vaccinated animals which will test positive for the strain?
 - e. Who is to cover the cost of the “required” fencing?
 - f. Taking an animal off the clean list is extreme, especially when the animal(s) are used heavily on farms, thus providing food, milk and fiber for their owners without taking from the wild. Think of domestic goats/sheep as another form of wild goat/sheep conservation – most farmers I know take great care in our animals to produce the healthiest for our families.
 - g. Once these questions are answered and the proposal is re-written will we as the public at large be able to weigh in on the new verbiage?
- 2.) I have heard over the last 3 days “pre-emptive” strike on several occasions.
 - a. The stakes are high – our wild life and our farms.
 - b. As a farmer I do the same, I test for diseases I have seen decimate animals.
 - c. As a farmer – the proposal as written is an extreme proposal written under bias and with duly noted fear of decimation, but logic needs to prevail.
- 3.) Make a table or forum to ensure the safety of our wildlife and our farms
 - a. Invite those who want this proposal, those who care about the wildlife and farmers; let us work together to do what is best for Alaskans and our wild life and our farms – because we can coexist.

I am hopeful the board will note these objections and not pass this proposal as written. I am hopeful after the last three days of testimony you see the farmers are just as concerned for our wildlife as you are and while we are open to solutions which benefit the wildlife, this proposal is not it.

Kari Butler – The Butler’s Crazy Farm, Nikiski Alaska