

I support Proposal 142

My name is Nan Eagleson and I have been living and working in the Denali Park area for 30 years. I have been a member of the Middle Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee for over ten years. These comments are independent of the Advisory Committee and are not intended to represent it. I support Proposal 142 and encourage the Board to do so as well. This proposal, to establish a no-wolf-take zone, is similar to the one the Board supported for 10 years and proved effective in protecting wolves that den in Denali National Park. Wolves naturally stray outside the park wilderness boundary following caribou and are particularly vulnerable in the early spring when breeding and pregnant females can be shot or trapped, as has been documented in the past. Evidence exists that the taking of one wolf, if a pregnant female, disrupts the entire pack. Proposal 142 is sensible, fair and considerate of the multitude of people living in the area that are non-consumptive users of wolves and are reliant on tourism for income, or simply appreciate the intrinsic value of this animal. Wolf numbers have declined considerably since the buffer zone sun-setted 7 years ago. There are few intact ecosystems left, even in Alaska, that can manage for natural abundance. If we really did "ecosystems management", the Yanert River Valley to the east, the Nenana River Corridor and the Wolf Townships would all be included in the wilderness protection of the park. This proposal is asking for a minuscule but important portion of that. The few numbers of trappers and hunters affected by this proposal pales in comparison to the multitude of visitors, from around the world, who come here for the possibility of seeing this animal or at least glimpsing the wild lands that sustain them. Because so much of Alaska is managed to maintain relatively high harvest objectives, there should be an effort by Fish and Game to cooperate with partners who manage for natural abundance on Federal lands. We all know the Wolf Townships should have been included in the original park boundary. This is an opportunity to partially rectify that. Thank you for considering support for this proposal.

I would also like to comment on Proposal 72

Again, I am not representing the Middle Nenana Fish And Game Advisory Committee, however, I would like to note that there was only one member on our committee who voted in supported of this proposal, aside from it's author.

I oppose Proposal 72 . This proposal is over the top in its broad inclusion of so many units (9 altogether) for land and shoot, same day harvesting of wolves and coyotes for both resident and non-resident "hunters" with a trapping license. There is no scientific evidence of the author's claim of an "ever-burgeoning predator population" in these areas. This proposal is a thinly disguised business strategy by a guide who sells predator hunts. The shabbiness of hunter-clients, usually rich urban men who know nothing about fair play, or true sport, or the Sub-arctic for that matter, are lured by the illusion of the exaggerated dangers of hunting predators by land and shoot. Then congratulated for their bravery and daring, is both ludicrous and tragic that a wolf is so cheaply killed. We are better than this. Why is killing a wolf such a triumph? I have no problem with the independent trapper who hones their personal skills but this business of same day land and shoot is anything but sporting. Please do not support this proposal.