

RC 086

Board of Game
Board Support Division
Via Fax 907-465-6094

Dear Board of Game,

Please accept these follow up comments in response to proponents of Proposal 90 which have suggested in public testimony that Proposal 90 be amended to include passage of the Proposal, but with a delayed implementation period ("2 years"). My wife and I submitted written comments during the initial comment period, and we continue to oppose this Proposal or any amendment in any form, including removal of domestic goats and sheep from the State's clean list. I request that you oppose this specific Proposal as well.

My wife and I own a small goat dairy in Wasilla far from wild sheep habitat. My wife is a leader within the Alaska goat industry and administers a Facebook group, "Alaska Goat Talk", that has over 600 members. She and Suzy Crosby were the two "goat owners" which the Wild Sheep Foundation (WSF) mentioned during his testimony that he met with several weeks ago along with the Alaska Farm Bureau.

As noted by the hundreds of commenters that submitted written public testimony, and those additional individuals that were able to travel to Fairbanks to make verbal public testimony at the Board of Game meeting, the current Proposal is simply materially flawed. It is at its core based a lop sided "threat" premise by one group (WSF), at the expense of another group and an entire agricultural industry involving domestic sheep and goats.

The amendment as proposed by members of the WSF and limited others associated with the guiding industry is to "pass but delay implementation", yet this continues to be nothing more than a "threat based" proposition by the WSF wherein they suggest that this will "force the agricultural industry to the table". WE ARE ALREADY AT THE TABLE!!! We've already been forced to come to the table as a result of the WSF's lack of any transparent effort to find a collaborative resolution to this issue that is balanced and focused on the real risk areas, and as noted in public testimony the agricultural industry only became aware of Proposal 90 as a result of an inadvertent email about 1 month ago, not any effort by the WSF to consult with us over the past 8 months or so that this Proposal has apparently been filed with the BOG by the WSF.

My wife and I, and I would argue virtually all members of the Alaska agricultural industry, support reasonable and focused steps to protect Alaska's Wild Sheep. For the WSF and its members to suggest anything other than this is not only disingenuous, but further exhibitivive of

their extreme deference to get something passed involving Proposal 90 at this Board of Game (BOG) meeting even at the expense of a legitimate, appropriate, and fair dialogue with other affected parties. Their actions are not consistent with Alaskan values of inclusion of all parties that may be affected, nor are they efforts to achieve a reasonable and solution based compromise. After listening for the first time to the BOG meeting via the live audio feed, it does not seem as though the WSF's tactics are representative of the BOG's values of dialogue with the public and listening to the concerns of the public and reaching reasonable solutions and compromise.

Passage of Proposal 90, in any amended form which delays implementation is nothing more than an unnecessary hammer over the agricultural industry's and domestic goat and sheep owners heads. To date, aside from the BOG's own public testimony process, we have not been invited or able to have an honest, fair dialogue with the WSF. We've only been threatened by their Proposal and by its members. The WSF proposes an extreme measure of removal of domestic goats and sheep from the Clean List as the absolute necessary measure, and threaten legal and legislative action to pursue their extreme goals. We welcome an opportunity, without a one-sided "two year looming threat" hanging over us, to have an honest dialogue with reasonable members of the WSF to reach solutions that are genuine and are focused on real protections needed. Not extreme overreach proposals that are costly and devastating to other Alaskan residents and an entire industry, and that the State of Alaska cannot afford to administer.

Instead of the WSF's current approach to address their concerns by completing "surgery with an axe" to the detriment of all parties but themselves, we should focus on real, and focused solutions. Let's have the ADF&G define what areas are "Wild Sheep Habitat" for the purposes of this issue. Then let's restrict ownership of domestic goats and sheep within these defined habitat areas, or within a reasonable buffer zone (1 mile for instance) without a permit, with such permit conditioned upon appropriate fencing and disease free testing of their herd. Let's define what specific bacteria or diseases should be tested for that are legitimate, scientifically based concerns for transmission to Wild Sheep.

■ a guide, on Monday testified that he believed the areas of concern were in Palmer, Tok, and Copper Center where domestic sheep or goats lived as the base of mountain areas where wild sheep existed. Let's focus on those areas of true concern, not a hatchet approach defining the entire State as potential risk areas. They are not. Let's not subject hundreds, perhaps thousands of Alaskans, to financially burdensome requirements and infringe upon their personal liberties, which are not actually necessary to provide reasonable risk based solutions to the areas of legitimate concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide further comment. We stand ready to continue a healthy, honest, and focused dialogue on this issue to reach common and reasonable solutions that are truly risk based, not zealous overreach.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Tina Judd

Wasilla, Alaska

(907)-376-6590