



PC944

**Name:** Yvonne Holcomb

**Community of Residence:** U.S.A.

**Comment:**

Stop the murder of animals!!!! Wildlife are living beings & the killing of life is murder!!! Humans have no right to just kill off what they think is feasible just to get rid of headaches. Do the right thing & come up with an alternative, like relocate. I oppose opposition 75!!!

---



PC945

**Name:** Dawn Holman

**Community of Residence:** Lake Clark

**Comment:**

Strongly oppose proposal 75! No aerial killing of brown bears

---



PC946

**Name:** Jo Holo

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposition 75. This is a cruel waste of money that will not bring back balance to the ecosystems

---



PC947

**Name:** Deidra Holum

**Community of Residence:** Ketchikan

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75 which would authorize ADFG to kill black bears, brown bears, and wolves with the use of aircraft, including helicopters, in all of Game Unit 16 in order to achieve predator reduction goals. There is no scientific data to support such extreme predator control measures and in fact data from ADFG's own study shows no increase in moose harvests following nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska. While the state of Alaska struggles to fund basic services like education, ADFG's budget requires significant annual increases to support a group of helicopter and aerial cowboys with little effect. As a lifelong Alaskan and a person who enjoys the diversity of large carnivores across this beautiful state I urge the Board to support the use of rigorous science to determine a more responsible and sustainable approach to management of wildlife in Game Unit 16 and to require public comment on any operational plans for aerial gunning.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Please vote against Proposal 75.

---



PC948

**Name:** Ingrid Homburg

**Community of Residence:** Australia

**Comment:**

RE: Proposal 75 - Please don't kill brown bears, what a barbaric action to take. It is not our right as humans to kill other animals. I strongly oppose this proposal and ask you find a more peaceful way forward in which bears and humans can co-exist. Killing brown bears is not the way!

---



PC949

**Name:** Cathy Hook

**Community of Residence:** Oklahoma

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - oppose

Predator control in this way is not scientifically based. This does not take into consideration ecosystem balance, but is driven by human desires only. Historically, predator control of this kind does not have a positive outcome when you look at all factors in the ecosystem. Allow natural hunting instead of this inhumane way of killing animals.

I do not support this proposal.

---



PC950

**Name:** Jamie Hook

**Community of Residence:** Oklahoma

**Comment:**

I am strongly opposed to Proposition 75. These are animals who have been brought back from near extinction. Why anyone would think this is a good idea is truly hard to comprehend. I am not aware of any instances where predator control by humans has ever provided a long term solution. Please do not let this happen.

---



PC951

**Name:** Yvonne Hooper

**Community of Residence:** Hampshire

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

I oppose the idea of killing VITAL eco system predators wolves bears have been scientifically proven to restore wild areas and the Yellowstone USA (before & after wolves wiped out and then restored) is a prime example of how much these predators are vital.. wherever wolves are wiped out it affects the

biodiversity and that's a mistake to do it in a climate crisis. Please remember hunting has taken biodiversity down to 3% on this earth and for that as scientifically proven every part of Nature around the world has suffered and that directly affects all human life as we see weekly in extreme weather events due to the unbalance of the eco system. This planet does not have the capacity to lose any more wildlife they are the only life forms capable of keeping life in the ecosystem and ecological balance.

Please consider the importance of wolves and bears and the majority of people enjoy seeing these magnificent intelligent sentient animals alive and thriving and that way everyone can continue to learn more about them.

---



PC952

**Name:** Marianne Hoosier

**Community of Residence:** Homer

**Comment:**

Proposal #75 Be Wise, Not Bold

I am grateful to come from a family lineage with a deep innate knowledge and respect for the complexities of nature and balance. I come from a gardener and a hunter-gatherer family upbringing. This mix has resulted in me being a gardener and a hunter. It's a blend that helps me understand the respect we should have for Earth and all of its inhabitants, including the very intelligent and often elusive wolf.

I have had several encounters with wolves while in remote wildernesses. In two of these close encounters, we each stopped and looked into each other's eyes before they turned and left. During those brief moments, it felt like time stopped. These are powerful moments that will last my lifetime.

I know a few true hunters who understand this balance of nature and respect for the animals that they take. These people do not brag or display their kills as conquests. While these true hunters do experience an adrenaline rush during the hunt, they understand that part of that rush is knowing that you are about to end a living being's life, which is sad and painful. If you do not experience the pain or sorrow for the animal that you are about to take, then you should reexamine who you are or who you have become. Shooting wolves and bears from a helicopter or aircraft does not show respect for the animal. Claiming that this method will somehow improve the balance of nature (despite scientific evidence proving otherwise) reflects arrogance and ignorance.

Be a trustworthy steward of the animals and land. Be wise, not bold.

---



PC953

**Name:** Andrew Hope

**Community of Residence:** London

**Comment:**

Subject: Opposition to Proposal 75 – A Call for Ethical, Evidence-Based Wildlife Management

Dear Alaska Board of Game,

As a resident of London, England, and a prospective visitor to Alaska, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75, which seeks to authorize aerial gunning of wolves and bears in Game Management Unit 16. My interest in Alaska lies in its extraordinary wildlife viewing opportunities, which contribute significantly to its global reputation and economic vitality through sustainable tourism.

I am deeply concerned that Proposal 75 lacks the necessary scientific foundation, ethical consideration, and long-term sustainability required for responsible wildlife management. I respectfully submit the following points for your consideration:

### 1. Absence of Baseline Data and Monitoring

The implementation of predator control programs without reliable population data is deeply troubling. For example, the Mulchatna Predator Control program targeted extensive bear culling without baseline population estimates, illustrating a disregard for the scientific rigor necessary for informed management decisions. Bears, in particular, are vulnerable to overharvesting due to their slow reproduction rates. This lack of data increases the risk of long-term population declines, with potentially irreversible ecological consequences.

### 2. Ineffectiveness of Predator Control

Decades of predator control efforts have failed to demonstrate consistent benefits for prey populations. A 2022 study found that nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska did not lead to measurable increases in moose harvests, challenging the effectiveness of such interventions. This raises questions about whether Proposal 75 can achieve its stated objectives or will instead waste resources on an unproven approach.

### 3. Ethical Concerns and Public Perception

Aerial gunning of predators is a practice that raises significant ethical concerns and risks damaging Alaska's reputation as a responsible steward of its natural resources. As a potential visitor, I am drawn to Alaska by its image as a haven for wildlife and unspoiled ecosystems. Practices perceived as inhumane or unsustainable may deter tourists and diminish Alaska's global appeal, negatively impacting its economy.

### 4. Impact on Slow-Reproducing Species

Bears are especially vulnerable to population declines due to their low reproductive rates and long intervals between litters. Intensive predator control measures, implemented without reliable data, could severely reduce bear populations, disrupting ecological balance and diminishing opportunities for wildlife viewing—a major draw for international tourists like me.

### 5. Economic and Tourism Impact

Alaska's predators, including wolves and bears, are key draws for international tourists. Wildlife viewing contributes significantly to the state's economy, supporting local businesses and jobs. Removing these iconic species from ecosystems near Denali and Lake Clark National Parks risks diminishing Alaska's attractiveness as a premier destination for wildlife enthusiasts, with potential economic repercussions.

### 6. Legal and Policy Considerations

The Intensive Management (IM) law emphasizes increasing harvestable numbers of certain prey species. However, this has often resulted in predator control as a default mechanism due to challenges in implementing alternative strategies such as habitat improvement. This approach overlooks the broader

ecological impacts of predator removal and the need for a balanced, evidence-based management framework.

#### Conclusion

I urge the Board to prioritize sustainable, science-based wildlife management practices that reflect ethical considerations and long-term ecological integrity. Decisions made without robust data and monitoring not only threaten Alaska's unique ecosystems but also risk alienating visitors who value its wild and unspoiled nature. Preserving Alaska's natural heritage is vital to maintaining its global reputation as a leader in conservation and a world-class destination for wildlife tourism.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I hope the Board will act in the best interests of Alaska's ecosystems, economy, and reputation by rejecting Proposal 75.

Sincerely,

Andrew Hope

London, England

---



PC954

**Name:** Phillip Horn

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 I 100% oppose and do not agree for the removal of wolves , brown bear , black bear in no shape or form . We should keep the wild wild . And look at the amount of money that these animals bring to Alaska by tourist and alike . Do not kill our wild animals to reduce populations in masses from an aircraft .

---



PC955

**Name:** Toni Horn

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 I am opposed.

This in my opinion would negatively impact your tourism. The untouched land and wildlife is why myself and countless others make trips to Alaska.

Furthermore this is not conservation. This is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is lazy, irresponsible wildlife management in a place that deserves so much more care and respect.

---



PC956

**Name:** Allison Horn

**Community of Residence:** Redmond Washington

**Comment:**

Please do not pass proposal 75. Predator reduction efforts have not been shown to effectively raise populations of moose and caribou. Outside of the fact that it doesn't work, please consider the environmental impacts. Alaska is the state with the most remaining wilderness, destroying predator populations in a futile attempt to raise the number of game animals for hunters is horrific. There are not that many wolves left at all (a few thousand is quite low) and yet people want to gun them down from helicopters? Many hunters claim to enjoy being out in nature. Killing off of a key part of the ecosystem is contradictory to those ideals. Personally, my favorite thing about Alaska is the vast wilderness that outshines every other place in the US. Just looking at the seemingly endless forests is incredible, the state is full of wildlife that needs protection. Hunters ability to shoot game is not more important than preserving Alaskas diverse array of both predator and prey species. I beg of you to reject proposal 75.

---



PC957

**Name:** Kim Horvath

**Community of Residence:** Ottawa, Canada

**Comment:**

Re. Proposal 75, the culling of black bears in Alaska, I fail to understand how anyone in wildlife management can possibly justify the slaughter of any predator species. It is well known that deer populations are decimating ecosystems by overgrazing. You need look no further than studies done on the reintroduction of wolves in Yellowstone Park. When predators control deer populations, ALL flora and fauna benefit. In Yellowstone, many long-gone species, like beavers, returned to the park after decades of absence. Do NOT repeat the mistakes that other states have made; learn from them. Nurture black bear populations and EVERY other wildlife species will be nurtured in turn. "Management" is not about mass killing, it's about restoring the balance that humans have destroyed. Stop this vicious cycle now, before we are alone on this planet and our own existence is in peril.

---



PC958

**Name:** Stephanie Hoston

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles, CA

**Comment:**

OPPOSE - Proposal 75 - It is not right to shoot down these wild animals. They deserve to live freely, without human interference. We must stand up for these animals without a voice and give them the respect and the dignity they deserve. Thank you for your time and for doing what is right - protecting the lives of these animals.

---



PC959

**Name:** Jessica Howard

**Community of Residence:** The United States of America

**Comment:**

Proposition 75 is an outright atrocity. Aerial gunning of bears is a grotesque overreach that will devastate the ecosystem of Lake Clark National Park. Bears are a vital part of the natural balance, and this reckless policy risks throwing the entire ecosystem into chaos. There are better, humane ways to manage wildlife—this is a barbaric step backward. Reject this horrendous proposal and protect Alaska's wilderness from senseless destruction.

---



PC960

**Name:** Vanessa Howard

**Community of Residence:** United States of America

**Comment:**

Opposition to Prop 75

I strongly urge you to prohibit the use of aerial gunfire to kill brown bears. This practice is inhumane, unsportsmanlike, and disrupts the ecological balance these apex predators maintain. Ethical wildlife management requires humane, science-based methods, not extreme measures that cause unnecessary suffering and public outrage. Allowing aerial gunfire could tarnish the reputation of those responsible for wildlife management and provoke widespread criticism from conservationists, scientists, and the general public.

Please protect these magnificent animals by rejecting aerial gunfire as a hunting practice. This is absolutely outrageous. I trust that you will make the right decision to protect our natural heritage and uphold humane standards in wildlife management.

---



PC961

**Name:** Janelle Howard

**Community of Residence:** Richmond Virginia

**Comment:**

I am in staunch opposition of the senselessly cruel Proposal 75. This is a absolutely disgusting plan, and for what?

---



PC962

**Name:** Chase Hoyt

**Community of Residence:** Community of Alaska

**Comment:**

I fervently oppose proposal 75. It is unlawful and inhumane to allow any killing of wolves and bears from helicopter, or in any manner. This shall not pass.

---



PC963

**Name:** Virginia Huang

**Community of Residence:** Vancouver, WA

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75 which would allow public aerial shooting of wolves and permit the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to lethally remove wolves, black bears, and brown bears by any means—using state, private, or chartered helicopters and equipment. Prop 75 is part of 5AAC92.122 Intensive Management Plan that has aggressive goals to reduce up to 80% of wolves, 60–80% of black bears, and 60% of brown bears.

Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities.

---



PC964

**Name:** Jakara Hubbard

**Community of Residence:** McKinley Village (Denali Park)

**Comment:**

I am writing to strongly urge you not to pass proposal 75 to authorize ADFG employees to conduct aerial gunning of wolves in Management Unit 16 as part of its Intensive Management (predator control) strategy. These strategies have proven to ultimately be detrimental to the ecosystem by creating an imbalance in the natural predator and prey dynamics, resulting in unhealthy prey populations and over-browsed habitat. It's unnecessary and wasteful. Predator control at this scale is costly, does not work as intended, and in many cases props up arbitrary, unachievable population goals for moose in the name of

hunter opportunity. This is particularly concerning because of its border with Denali National Park, our crown jewel. Wolves are an important part of our tourism economy and we are shooting ourselves in the foot by prioritizing the satisfaction of some over the benefits to all. There's nothing sportsmanlike or scientific about aerial gunning and I'm ashamed to be associated with these state-sanctioned, misguided practices as an Alaskan resident.

---



PC965

**Name:** Sue Huckabee

**Community of Residence:** Broomfield

**Comment:**

Prop 75.

---



PC966

**Name:** Alison Huggan

**Community of Residence:** Dailly

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. Please don't do this.

---



PC967

**Name:** Robert Hughes

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Strongly Oppose Prop 75

These animals have been eradicated from so much of their natural habitat across North America. I always saw Alaska as a sanctuary for these amazing animals. It seems likely that we will see major roll backs regarding conservation and the preservation of the ecological integrity of this beautiful country in the coming years. And it starts with Proposals like this. Very sad. The natural world deserves better.

---



PC968

**Name:** Lynn Hughes

**Community of Residence:** England

**Comment:**

I hereby oppose proposal 75 allowing aerial hunting of bears and wolves in Alaska.

I consider this proposal to be barbaric in today's society. Too many animals are killed in the name of conservation and if this action was supported, it would open the floodgates for any person to go trophy hunting in the name of sport.

Wildlife should be cherished and left alone.

---



PC969

**Name:** Viktória Hulényi

**Community of Residence:** Hungary

**Comment:**

Proposal number 75. - We as human beings have NO RIGHT to take Mother Nature's matters into our own hands and to start an insane and unnecessary killing of wild animals! We should respect nature's ways and leave them be. Animals are not ours to use and/or decide their fate. All these type of "projects" must be banned instead!

---



PC970

**Name:** Henry Hunsaker

**Community of Residence:** Waxhaw

**Comment:**

I am against proposal 75, wildlife such as bears and wolves are already endangered and they are very important to the environment, hunting them in these numbers will greatly decline the population and contribute heavily to their overall extinction, it's barbaric and disgusting that this is even being considered.

---



PC971

**Name:** Stephanie Hunter

**Community of Residence:** Farmington, Utah

**Comment:**

I do not agree with Proposal 75. I believe this is an ethical issue that could result in severe, and unknown consequences.

---



PC972

**Name:** emma hurley

**Community of Residence:** Santa Barbara

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. Wildlife is of the utmost importance, we as humans, mess with the world enough, gunning down wolves and bears from helicopters is not only inhumane and unnatural, but straight up

cruel. We need to be protecting this wildlife, it is valuable to our planet and the ecosystems. It it not fair to be killing these innocent lives, let nature and animals do their own thing for once and maybe the worlds ecosystems and the climate and the soils and everything will start coming back into balance. It starts here.

---



PC973

**Name:** Mackenzie Huth

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75.

---



PC974

**Name:** Ashley Hutton

**Community of Residence:** Palmer

**Comment:**

I am commenting on proposal 75 and as a lifelong Alaskan I oppose this proposal. Most of my life has been spent in rural Alaska, we only recently moved to Palmer. I understand the importance of subsistence food to a rural community. I also understand that predator control does not boost prey harvest for people. There is no scientific evidence for predator control increasing subsistence moose harvest but there is sure a lot of anecdotal evidence. I also understand that this would cost a lot of money that could be better spent managing the game in this state in a more responsible manner.

It's embarrassing that we as Alaskans think the best thing to do is to shoot our local predators, those that keep our huge ecosystems in check, from airplanes like cowards. Please do not approve proposal 75. Thank you.

---



PC975

**Name:** Michelle Ibanez

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I am commenting on proposal 75. Please do not interfere in the wildlife.

---



PC976

**Name:** Armando Ibanez

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

This is towards proposal 75. Please do not kill the animals!!!! This is inhumane and the animals deserve to be protected

---



PC977

**Name:** Michael Ice

**Community of Residence:** Wyoming

**Comment:**

Please do not "manage" the fauna by lethal means. This is not science. Leave nature alone, it manages itself.

No to prop 75

---



PC978

**Name:** Karen Iovino

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Our wildlife is sacred. I oppose prop75. Gunning down from aircraft is reprehensible. Wolves are innocent and need protection. This is a heinous "sport".

---



PC979

**Name:** Kayla Irvin

**Community of Residence:** Ontario

**Comment:**

Oppose #75. This is cruel! Especially trying to gun down huge percentages of each population

---



PC980

**Name:** Dorie Isaac

**Community of Residence:** Phoenix

**Comment:**

Oppose #75

---



PC981

**Name:** Jill Isbell

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Oppose prop 75

---



PC982

**Name:** Frédéric Izquierdo

**Community of Residence:** Montréal, QC, Canada

**Comment:**

Against proposition 75.

This kind of proposal is not acceptable considering the global loss of biodiversity. Instead of this kind of proposal, funding and efforts should be put to preserve and protect ecosystem and its biodiversity.

Thank you for your understanding and time.

Best regards,

Fred Izquierdo

---



PC983

**Name:** Ilona J.

**Community of Residence:** Estonia

**Comment:**

Opposing to proposal 75.

Protect the wildlife.

---



PC984

**Name:** Karen Jackson

**Community of Residence:** St catharines ontario

**Comment:**

I oppose bill 75.

Please manage wildlife safely and appropriately with consideration to all stakeholders... bears ( who are tgreathened and cannot speak for themselves), community, local economy and natural resources.

---



PC985

**Name:** Stephanie Jacobs

**Community of Residence:** Orange county

**Comment:**

OPPOSE PROP 75.

**Inhumane and Unethical Methods:** Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

**Threat to Ecosystem Balance:** Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

**Lack of Transparency and Oversight:** Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

**Conservation and Economic Risks:** Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities.

---



PC986

**Name:** Riyaan Jain

**Community of Residence:** Urbana, Illinois

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Do not kill the Bears! Earth is a special planet with an abundance of life that has taken millions and millions of years to reach this point of incredible biodiversity. Who are we humans to destroy such a unique planet? Who are we to murder? We are not killers. We find joy in nurturing and caring for each other and animals. We do not live to kill. There is no need to kill the Bears. Find an alternate solution that does not involve destroying our planet further. We have no right to. There is no need to. When you were born, you had no choice over who you were born as, which family, which body, which country. The physical form in which you were born as is independent from the living conscious that you truly are. This extends to not being born as a human being too. You could have been any other animal, any other living thing. The soul of the bear is no different to the soul we are inhabiting this human body. The bear feels pain and happiness, jealousy and envy, appreciates nature, and enjoys eating and pooping the way we do. If you feel bad murdering another human being for no reason, you should feel bad murdering an animal too for no reason.

---



PC987

**Name:** Vivian Jamieson

**Community of Residence:** Ladson sc

**Comment:**

I opposed proposition 75.

---



PC988

**Name:** Addison Jane

**Community of Residence:** CA

**Comment:**

75- protect the wildlife

---



PC989

**Name:** Amanda Janes

**Community of Residence:** Kodiak island

**Comment:**

Proposition 75 is far too aggressive of a change for Alaskan wildlife. It is outrageous.

---



PC990

**Name:** Aspen Jared

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - oppose. Chasing down wolves and killing them from an aerial view is inherently cruel and inhumane. Not only is this method ineffective for population management, it can make things worse for wildlife. Why not pursue on a nonlethal path using science based research?

---



PC991

**Name:** JJ Jenkins

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

OPPOSE proposal 75

---



PC992

**Name:** Gloria Jenkins

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #75. We've fought aerial gunning of wolves for over 50 years now. It's time to end this brutal practice. Wolves (and bears) are important species vital for a healthy ecosystem. No reason on earth to eliminate or even decrease their numbers. Wildlife in America and throughout the world is in crisis. End trophy hunting of animals, especially wolves and bears. Participation in hunting is decreasing in popularity--no wonder--wanton killing of animals is rightly unpopular. Alaska is a tourist destination because of its' natural beauty and diverse population of animals. It's high time to start protecting animals for our and future generations.

---



PC993

**Name:** Kristin Jenkins

**Community of Residence:** West Palm Beach, Fl

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 for many reasons, but the biggest one is that nature tends to balance itself out over time. If we feel that the black bear, brown bear, and wolf populations are too large on the west side of Cook Inlet it is our duty to step back and allow nature to take its course. Like all animals, predators have a maximum number that their ecosystem can support. The population of predators and prey ebb and flow and eventually will balance themselves out in due time. If we interfere too fast the balance will be off and then we will need to tend to a growing prey population. Please consider another option before deciding to ruthlessly kill animals from the sky.

---



PC994

**Name:** Cailen Jennings

**Community of Residence:** Palmer

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the implementation of Proposal 75. The percentage of wolves, as well as black and brown bears that would be allowed to be legally killed is astronomical and completely unnecessary. Humans have co-existed with these animals for decades and killing 60-80% of their populations is unthinkable, extremely excessive, and cruel.

---



PC995

**Name:** Theodore Jennings

**Community of Residence:** Seattle

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is a bear genocide that will not conserve any of the species you are worried about. This is not a decision made with local wildlife in mind. This is lazy, irresponsible, evil, and will do unfixable damage to our earth and bear population. Don't be stupid.

---



PC996

**Name:** Trevor Jensen

**Community of Residence:** Idaho

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75, on the degree of reduction of wolf and bear populations.

---



PC997

**Name:** Sheila Jett

**Community of Residence:** New Jersey, USA

**Comment:**

I vehemently OPPOSE Proposal 75 for Aerial Gunning of Bears & Wolves. This method of "wildlife management" is cruel and barbaric. Wanton waste as well. Please consider giving locals a hunting permit for a responsible, controlled hunt if this is absolutely necessary. Or please find a way to relocate these precious animals who DO NOT DESERVE TO BE MURDERED. This is the home of these beautiful animals. They need to be honored and treasured, not savagely destroyed. I am a wildlife photographer and am devastated by the intentions of Propisal 75. Bears and wolves are magnificent gifts to the world.

---



PC998

**Name:** Anna Johnson

**Community of Residence:** The earth

**Comment:**

Prop 75- OPPOSE

This is not okay and will never be okay. The more we kill and disconnect from the land that holds us, the more we suffer as humans.

---



PC999

**Name:** Jamie Johnson

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75 because predator population should be controlled in carefully considered, proven conservationist methods such as increasing hunter tags for the next 2-10 years, and re-evaluating the population balances each year to determine the best plan of action for the following years. Gunning down animals from the air is a drastic, cruel and irresponsible choice for the area and for the animal populations on the whole. Please re-think this proposal and find a more gradual way to resolve concerns. A resolution that addresses overpopulation of predators if that is true in the area, but also works with the experts in their field to do what is best for the ecosystem in the long run. Think long term - not short term here. Consult the people who work locally and are educated on these delicate natural balances. Thank you for listening.

---



PC1000

**Name:** Emma Johnson

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Prop 75 is not a solution for anything. The only real solution is research-based scientific action to restore an ecosystem peacefully without mass killings.

---



PC1001

**Name:** Kirk Johnson

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing to say I strongly oppose Proposition 75. I have been camping and bear viewing all through Game Management Unit 16 since 1982. Throughout that timeframe, I have seen more and more people interested in "Viewing Bears" that can sustain Alaska's tourism economy and more and more frightened and skitish bears in areas that are open to seasonal hunting. Support Alaska's future by protecting the few bears and wolves that are left. Killing them makes no sense for Alaska Tourism and makes the State of Alaska look foolish in the eyes of all other countries on the planet.....

---



PC1002

**Name:** Gina Johnson

**Community of Residence:** Gilroy

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Humans have caused this imbalance in nature it is not due to over predation by natural predators such as bears and wolves. There decline is largely due to disease and lack of food. Predators actually help stop the spread of disease by killing the diseased ones which helps stop the spread. In 2017 250 wolves were killed and the herd population fell drastically. Obviously it was not due to predators. Maybe you should address the real issue that is causing this decline like climate change and killing predators that help keep the herds healthy. Just call it what it is, an easy way for the state to make money not concern for the long term health of an ecosystem.

---



PC1003

**Name:** Caitlin Johnston

**Community of Residence:** Lancaster, PA

**Comment:**

Oppose prop 75. The wildlife is incredibly important to Canada's ecosystem and critical for survival of other species.

---



PC1004

**Name:** Skyler Jolley

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning.

This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1005

**Name:** Ashley Jones

**Community of Residence:** Alabama

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Prop 75. Increasing local hunting quotas for bear and wolf populations would at least benefit local economies. But aerial kills is wasteful and cruel. These large predator populations are already facing threats from mining, land loss/developments. And both are critical keystone species. This is NOT a "conservation" method that I can support.

---



PC1006

**Name:** Karen Jones

**Community of Residence:** Johnson

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. I'm horrified you don't let the species manage themselves and balance the ecosystem. This is murder to kill innocent animals who have no defense. Just awful. Stop stop

---



PC1007

**Name:** Jordan Jones

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks, Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposition 75 continues a pattern of failed predator control projects in Alaska. History has shown that aggressive predator management, such as intensive bear and wolf reductions, fails to produce the desired outcome for prey species like moose and caribou. Studies from previous efforts reveal little to no long-term benefits, as ecosystems are far more complex than these one-dimensional strategies acknowledge.

These methods disrupt the natural balance, harming both predators and prey populations. Bears play a critical role in maintaining healthy ecosystems by dispersing seeds, aerating soil, and regulating prey populations. Over-managing bears risks destabilizing these systems, leading to cascading effects that hurt other wildlife and the environment.

Millions of dollars have been spent on predator control programs, with little accountability or evidence of success. Proposition 75 risks repeating those mistakes and draining resources that could instead be used for habitat restoration and scientific research - proven to benefit all wildlife.

---



PC1008

**Name:** Karen Jones

**Community of Residence:** Johnson usa

**Comment:**

Oppose proposition 75. There is no proven record that humans are food deprived because of bear and wolf population. Yellowstone has proven that the species manage themselves and balance the ecosystem. This is barbaric murder of innocent animals who work hard to survive natural elements. It sickens me to think you would gun them down with the use of helicopters. What have we become? The spirit of nature is to let animals manage their own populations. This only proves that humans are a rare species capable of murder. Please stop and do better. Thank you

---



PC1009

**Name:** Paula Jones

**Community of Residence:** Reno, NV

**Comment:**

Please vote no on Proposal 75. I do not think this is an effective way to manage wildlife.

---



**Name:** Brad Josephs

**Community of Residence:** St Joe, Arkansas

**Comment:**

I graduated from UAF with BS wildlife biology, lived in Alaska 21 years, and still make my living as a bear viewing guide in Katmai and Lake Clark since 1999. . I strongly oppose Prop 75

1. Conservation and Economic Risks: Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities. The tourism value of healthy predator populations is a huge part of south central Alaska's economy.

2. Predators keep a natural prey balance, and without this, overgrazing can decimate habitat for many decades. This has been shown many times in the past and has been documented in the scientific literature.

---



**Name:** Subha Joshi

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 : I strongly oppose the proposed killing of wolves and bears in Unit 16B for several reasons.

**Ecological Importance of Predators:** Wolves and bears play vital roles in maintaining healthy ecosystems. They help regulate prey populations, prevent overgrazing, and promote biodiversity. Disrupting these natural balances can have unintended ecological consequences, potentially harming moose populations in the long run.

**Scientific Concerns:** The proposed plan assumes that reducing predators will increase moose numbers, but scientific studies suggest predator control programs often yield inconsistent and temporary results. Habitat quality, climate change, and human activities like overhunting also play significant roles in influencing prey populations.

**Ethical and Public Perception:** Many people, both locally and globally, view large-scale predator culling as inhumane and unnecessary. Wolves and bears are iconic species that deserve respect and coexistence, not eradication. Public support for conservation initiatives, including tourism, often hinges on preserving wildlife populations rather than destroying them.

**Economic and Participation Issues:** The program already struggles with low public participation due to poor pelt quality and alternative hunting opportunities. This suggests that broad support for predator control in this area is lacking. Introducing department-led culling risks alienating the public further, especially when alternative, non-lethal management strategies could be explored.

**Focus on Alternative Solutions:** Instead of predator culling, we urge the board to invest in habitat improvement for moose, better enforcement of hunting regulations, and scientific studies to address the

root causes of declining prey populations. These strategies offer sustainable, ethical, and scientifically sound solutions without resorting to mass killings.

Predator control should not be a default solution to complex ecological issues. We urge the board to reject the proposal to allow department-led culling of wolves and bears and instead prioritize conservation-based approaches that balance the needs of wildlife, ecosystems, and communities.



PC1012

**Name:** Vicki Jurica

**Community of Residence:** Grandview missouri

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. Aerial shooting of bears and wolves. Animals have value for simply being alive.



PC1013

**Name:** Anne Kahn

**Community of Residence:** Homer and Port Alsworth

**Comment:**

Opposition to Proposal 75

As a lifelong resident of Alaska, I have spent time in many parts of the state, including 17 years year-round on my property in Lake Clark National Preserve, within walking distance of Lake Clark National Park. Although my husband and I hunt for game meat and my husband is a former registered guide, we both abhor the slaughter of bears and wolves that has been authorized by the Alaska Dept of Fish and Game beginning in 2022 in western Alaska. It is equally appalling that yet another proposal (Proposal 75) to extend this slaughter to Game Management Unit 16, which borders Lake Clark and Denali National Parks is now in the works.

The public has been deceptively uninformed about these measures taking place, and when the measures are finally revealed, input from residents has been unwelcome.

There is no science to support Proposal 75. There is no economic evaluation of how these slaughters might impact the tourism industry. Look at the popularity of Fat Bear week to see how much people delight in images of bears in their natural habitats. Check out the numerous lodges and sight-seeing operations that rely on bear-viewing for their number one source of income. Many tourists come to this state with the specific hope of seeing a bear or wolf in the wild.

The members of the Alaska Board of Game clearly have no emotional ties to these animals, but I do. They are part of the ecosystem, and it saddens me tremendously to imagine their populations dwindling because a handful of individuals believe they are acting in the interest of the majority.

Again, I implore you to oppose Proposal 75.

Anne Kahn



PC1014

**Name:** Haley Kanaan

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to proposal 75 in unit 16 which aims to reduce the bear and wolf population by aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the value of wildlife conservation but also significantly will decrease the economy with a direct impact to the ecosystem and lower tourism for these beautiful wild life animals.



PC1015

**Name:** Mog Kao

**Community of Residence:** Maryland

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (ADF&G) practice of culling wolves, brown bears, and black bears to artificially increase caribou populations. This intensive predator control program is ecologically damaging, ethically questionable, and ultimately unsustainable.

This is a strong NO ON PROPOSAL 75.

The State's Intensive Management Policy states that predator control should be the last step considered, rather than an 'immediate tool.'

Moreover, scientists who are experts in the delicate AK ecosystem have questioned the rationale and effectiveness behind the Mulchatna intensive management proposals.

<https://www.adn.com/opinions/2024/07/04/opinion-biologists-dispute-the-states-mulchatna-intensive-management-rationale/>

What research is the state conducting to determine caribou habitat capacity fro the Mulchatna herd? The target level of 30,000 does not have enough data to support it as a realistic and achievable goal. It may not be feasible to manage the Mulchatna caribou at a sustained population level that permits high-levels of human harvest since the ADF&G's own historical data shows dramatic swings in the Mulchatna's herd size.

Studies have shown that bears are highly individualistic in their hunting habits. A blanket cull over a target area will likely kill bears that do not prey upon caribou at all. It would be a waste of effort, resources that would not yield the desired results.

The state should work on alternative measures to increase caribou herd size. Indigenous Protectors programs have been shown to be effective method; it was successful in southern British Columbia.

Predator control, in addition to being ineffective, is not the state's only option. Bears and wolves also play a vital role in maintaining a healthy overall ecosystem. They should not have to pay the price for lack of data and other factors that may be contributing to depressing the Mulchatna's herd size.

Sen Cory Booker (NJ) & Rep Raúl M. Grijalva (AZ) introduced a bill to protect bears, wolves, and bison, which advocates for coexistence among these 3 species with the understanding that the predator/pray dynamic is part of the ecosystem. S.5115 - Tribal Heritage and American Bison, Grizzly Bear, and Wolf Restoration and Coexistence Act. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/5115/text>. This is a wonderful example of an effort to achieve a long-term solution in wildlife management and conservation, reached through involvement of indigenous communities.

I urge you to reconsider the current predator control policies and invest in effective, long-term, sustainable solutions that prioritize ecosystem health and respect the intrinsic value of all wildlife.

Sincerely,

M Kao



PC1016

**Name:** Kate Rice, KAR Photography

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75, part of the 5 AAC 92.122 Intensive Management Plan, which seeks to reduce populations of wolves, black bears, and brown bears in Alaska. This proposal raises significant concerns not only for the ecological integrity of Alaska's wild landscapes but also for the state's economic well-being and ethical responsibilities.

Alaska is world-renowned for its unparalleled wildlife and natural beauty, drawing tourists from around the globe. Wildlife tourism—including brown bear viewing tours—is a major source of income for the state, directly supporting thousands of Alaskan business owners (including myself), guides, and communities. Tourists come to Alaska specifically to witness its iconic predators in their natural habitats, contributing significantly to the local economy through lodging, transportation, dining, and guided tours. Reducing predator populations would drastically impact this critical revenue stream, leading to economic harm for Alaskan businesses and diminishing the state's global reputation as a premier wildlife destination.

Beyond the economic implications, this proposal poses a severe threat to the delicate balance of Alaska's ecosystems. Predators like wolves, black bears, and brown bears play vital roles in maintaining healthy ecosystems by regulating prey populations and fostering biodiversity. Scientific studies consistently show that predator control measures, such as those proposed in Proposal 75, are not effective in significantly increasing ungulate populations over the long term. Instead, these methods often disrupt ecological balance, leading to unintended consequences that ripple through the environment.

Furthermore, the proposed aerial shooting of these animals is both inhumane and barbaric. Such practices cause undue suffering and are widely regarded as unethical by wildlife professionals and the general

public alike. Alaska has an obligation to manage its wildlife responsibly and with compassion, ensuring that management practices align with modern ethical standards and scientific evidence.

I urge you to reject Proposal 75 and instead prioritize sustainable, science-based wildlife management practices that support both Alaska's ecosystems and its economy. Protecting the state's predators ensures the continued viability of wildlife tourism and preserves the ecological heritage that makes Alaska unique.

Thank you for considering this important issue.



PC1017

**Name:** Adam Rice, KAR Safaris

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

To Whom It May Concern,

As an Alaskan business owner and wildlife tour operator, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75, part of the 5 AAC 92.122 Intensive Management Plan, which seeks to reduce populations of wolves, black bears, and brown bears in Alaska. This proposal directly threatens my livelihood and the sustainability of countless businesses across the state that rely on wildlife tourism.

My business depends on the presence of Alaska's iconic predators to attract visitors from around the world. Tourists come to Alaska with the dream of seeing wolves, black bears, and brown bears in their natural habitats. These experiences not only generate revenue for our tours but also support the broader Alaskan economy through associated spending on accommodations, transportation, dining, and other services. Reducing predator populations would devastate this critical tourism sector, directly impacting my business, and my family's future.

In addition to the economic harm, this proposal endangers the ecological balance that makes Alaska's wilderness so unique and vibrant. Predators play an essential role in maintaining healthy ecosystems by regulating prey populations and promoting biodiversity. Scientific evidence has repeatedly shown that predator control measures, such as those outlined in Proposal 75, do not lead to significant long-term increases in ungulate populations. Instead, these measures often result in ecological disruptions with far-reaching negative consequences.

Moreover, the proposed aerial shooting of these animals is inhumane and barbaric. As someone who works closely with wildlife and shares its wonders with visitors, I find such practices deeply troubling and inconsistent with the values of stewardship and respect that should guide Alaska's wildlife management policies.

I urge you to reject Proposal 75 and instead adopt wildlife management strategies that prioritize ecological health and the sustainable economic benefits that predators bring to our state. Protecting Alaska's wildlife is not only an ethical responsibility but also a necessary step to ensure the continued success of businesses like mine and the long-term prosperity of our communities.

Thank you for considering this critical issue.

---



PC1018

**Name:** Elisabeth Karna

**Community of Residence:** NY

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - inhumane

---



PC1019

**Name:** Christina Karpinski

**Community of Residence:** Matsu Valley

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. We need to protect our wildlife in Alaska, not gun them down by aerial shooting. Wildlife tourism is a big industry here and if the state starts thinning the herd, there will be a huge public backlash. It is also cruel to shoot animals from the air where accuracy isn't as controlled as on the ground and they may suffer a prolonged & painful death. Please vote 'no' on 75.

---



PC1020

**Name:** Sam Kasper

**Community of Residence:** Bradford

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposition #75. This is absurd and seemingly immoral. The country is watching - do the right thing and shoot this proposal down.

---



PC1021

**Name:** Diane Kastel

**Community of Residence:** Wheaton, IL

**Comment:**

Our family, strongly, protests your, deadly, and, cruel, "Proposal 75" to shoot wolves, from the air, and, deliberately, reduce, wolf, populations! It is a, dastardly, unethical, immoral proposal against a maligned, and, persecuted, species that is being killed in almost, every, state!

According to the "Alaska Wildlife Alliance", the Department" 's objectives for "Unit 16" include reducing populations by 73–80% of wolves!

These wolves need to be recovered in their habitats, NOT murdered! Your lack of compassion and sensitivity is shameful!

The "Alaska Wildlife Alliance" has flagged an, unconscionable, proposal will impact, wolf, populations near "Denali" and "Lake Clark National Parks"!

"Proposal 75" will allow the use of, aerial, gunning, and, other, lethal, methods to kill wolves and other, wildlife in Alaska's Unit 16", near some of Alaska's, treasured, National Parks! If passed, the Department of Fish and Game" would be authorized to use methods, like aerial gunning, (shooting wolves down from helicopters) across the, entire, "Unit 16", area, impacting ecosystems near these, iconic, National Parks!



PC1022

**Name:** Diane Kastel

**Community of Residence:** Wheaton, IL

**Comment:**

"Proposal 75": - Aerial Gunning Outside of Denali": OPPOSE!

"Proposal 75" has the potential to become, another "Mulchatna Predator Control Program", which has, so, far, killed over 200 brown bears in, southwest, Alaska! The proposal would add, Department, removal of wolves, brown bears, and, black bears, to "Unit 16"'s "Intensive Management Plan". "Unit 16" lies between "Denali National Park and Preserve" and "Lake Clark National Park and Preserve".

ADFG" would be authorized to kill wolves, brown bears, and, black bears, with the use of aircraft, including helicopters, to achieve, reduction, goals! The, reduction, goals, according to "Unit 16"'s "Intensive Management Plan", are:

Wolves: remove 73–80% of wolves, in the area, (population of 35- 55 wolves)

Brown bears: remove 60%, of brown bears, in the area (minimum population of 375)

Black bears: remove 60–80%, of black bears, in the area (minimum population of 700)

Why we oppose:

Studies have shown that Alaska's, predator, control, programs — aimed at boosting moose, caribou, and, deer, populations, for hunters — do NOT increase, human, moose, harvest!

Large, carnivore, management, in Alaska, is a reversion to, outdated, management, concepts, and, occurs without, effective, monitoring, programs designed to, scientifically, evaluate impacts on, predator, populations, or, identify, causal, relationships between, predator, control, and, pre-population, dynamics!

If approved, this proposal would give "ADFG" full, reign to implement an, aerial, gunning, plan in "Unit 16"! Once a proposal, like this, is approved, "ADFG" has the authority to develop an "Operational Plan" for, aerial, gunning that is NOT open to, public, comment!

---



**Name:** Diane Kastel

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

OUR FAMILY OPPOSES PROPOSAL 75!

This January, the Alaska Board of Game (BOG) will deliberate on nearly 200 proposals impacting wildlife, including Proposal 75, which was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG). ADFG is requesting sweeping authority to aerially gun wolves and bears on the west side of Cook Inlet, between Denali National Park and Lake Clark National Park.

Proposal 75 would authorize ADFG staff to kill black bears, brown bears, and wolves with the use of aircraft, including helicopters, in all of Game Unit 16 to “achieve [predator] reduction goals”.

About Unit 16

Game Management Unit 16 is approximately 22,000 square miles, about the size of West Virginia. The area consists of the drainages into Cook Inlet between Redoubt Creek and the Susitna River, the drainages on the west side of the Susitna River (including the Susitna River) upstream to its junction with the Chulitna River, the drainages into the west side of the Chulitna River (including the Chulitna River) upstream to the Tokositna River (including the Tokositna River), and drainages into the south side of the Tokositna River upstream to the base of the Tokositna Glacier. It also includes all seaward waters and lands within three miles of these coastlines.

The area proposed for aerial gunning shares borders with Denali National Park, Denali National Preserve, Denali State Park, Lake Clark National Preserve, and Lake Clark National Park, which are all used by non-hunting recreationists and wildlife enthusiasts. The area also surrounds the communities of Tyonek, Skwetna, Petersville, Peters Creek, and Alexander, and neighbors well-traveled communities like Talkeetna, Willow, and Caswell.

While people enjoy the experience of watching bears feed on the sedge grasses, clams, and fish in the world-famous Chitina Bay, just 40 miles north other bears may be shot from helicopters in the Redoubt Creek drainage. While people flock to Denali National Park and Denali State Park in hopes of seeing wolves, packs just south of those boundaries may be decimated by the same predator control program. And when those of us living in Anchorage and the Kenai Peninsula look across the Cook Inlet, soon we could be viewing an active aerial gunning program on some of Alaska’s most cherished wildlife.

What’s more, there are already ongoing IM and predator control programs in Units 13 and 17, which flank Unit 16 to the east and west. With an active predator control program in Unit 16, this could mean over 600 miles of land stretching east to west across the state would be managed to reduce or remove predators.

History of Intensive Management in Unit 16

The State of Alaska has been implementing an Intensive Management program against predators in portions of Unit 16 for over twenty years to increase moose populations.

In 2003, the State began an Intensive Management (IM) program against wolves in 6,972 square miles of Unit 16. The program faced legal challenges, including those brought by Alaska Wildlife Alliance, and in 2006 the Board of Game held an emergency meeting to revise the Intensive Management plan to bring it

into compliance with Alaska law by adding plan justifications, methods and means, predator and prey population objectives, and a time frame for updates and evaluations.

Later that year, after outlining the bare minimum in the plan to comply with the statute, the State increased the predator control area to 7,792 square miles and authorized public aerial shooting permits and public land-and-shoot permits.

In 2007, the Board added black bear removal to the plan and reauthorized the program for another 5 years, running from 2007 to 2012. Under the new black bear control provisions, the public could kill an unlimited number of black bears, cubs, and sows with cubs, and allowed fall black bear baiting. The goal was to reduce the black bear population by 60%.

In 2009, it got worse. The State authorized black bear snaring for the entire summer, allowed young hunters (10 to 15 years old) to kill bears, and allowed the use of helicopters to access black bear bait and foot-snaring camps.

In 2011, the Board reauthorized this plan for another 6 years, extending it to 2017 and adding brown bears. Under the expanded program, the public could kill brown bears over bait or with bucket snares

Example of a bucket snare. Bears reach in to retrieve the bait in the back of the bucket, which pulls on the trigger, and cinches the loop around the bear's foot.

In the Spring of 2012, ADFG staff studied the moose calf mortality survey in the Tyonek study area. After all, the predator-killing program was designed to benefit moose. However, the study found that calf survival remained low despite IM efforts. A spatial analysis "showed no relationship between bear harvest locations and calf survival within the Tyonek study area"( Operational Plan for Unit 16 IM, page 5).

In 2013, the Board re-assessed the plan and suspended predator control activities.

The state restarts the im program in unit 16

After just two short years, in 2015 the State began its IM activities in Unit 16 again. The Board Authorized an Intensive Management plan with the following objectives:

Reduce wolves by 70 to 80%, resulting in a population of 35 to 55 wolves (.34 - .54 wolves/100 square miles) for Unit 16B. Unit 16B includes Denali and Lake Clark National Park and Preserve lands, but those federal lands are closed to aerial gunning.

Reduce brown bear populations in 16B by 60%, and 80% for black bears, resulting in an estimated abundance of 375 brown bears and 700 black bears. There is no reliable information on black bear population status or trends in this area. Despite this, the Department made a "removal" goal of 60-80%.

Because it was deemed "ineffective", in 2017 the bear control was suspended. We anticipate that, with Proposal 75, ADFG will seek re-authorization of bear control at the Board of Game meeting in January.

How are moose, wolf, and bear populations measured for unit 16?

Moose: The IM objectives for moose in Unit 16 are a population size of 6,500 to 7,500 and a harvest between 310 and 600. In 2019, population estimates indicated that the moose population was well above the midpoint population objective, and harvest was also well within objectives and approaching the midpoint. Therefore, the IM objectives for moose population had been met.

Wolves: The most recent fall abundance estimate for Unit 16 was conducted over twenty years ago in 2003, based on a wolf study conducted in the winter of 1999. A minimum number of wolves was established in 1999 based on the number of wolves caught during the study. The estimate was “refined” in 2014.

Black bears: The last fall abundance assessment was conducted in 2007 using a line-transect sampling method. Density estimates were measured at 187 bears/1,000 km and were extrapolated to all of 16B. The spring abundance was estimated as being between 300 to 3,500 black bears. However, as ADFG writes in their Black Bear Management Report and Plan, Game Management Unit 16, “simple, repeatable, and accurate surveys have not been developed to assess the Unit 16 black bear population density.”

Brown bears: Similar to black bears, portions of 16B were sampled in 2007. Those data were integrated with a density continuum from Units 9 and 13 to determine a brown bear density of 40 bears/1,000km. The spring abundance for Unit 16 was estimated as being between 313 to 937 brown bears.

What does this mean for 2024 and proposal 75?

The State has set a goal of 35 to 55 wolves, meaning the State’s goal is to kill “at least 113 wolves” (Department comments on Prop 75, page 224). The proposal does not expressly outline a reduction goal for bears, but in the existing predator control plans for Unit 16, the goal is to reduce black bears by 60 to 80% and brown bears by 60%.

In their proposal, ADFG states that “the department has no plans to activate bear control at this time”, yet the State has a track record of authorizing bear control programs without a proposal, and of authorizing bear control in this game unit. The Department would not ask for the authority to aeri ally gun both wolves and bears unless they had the private inclination to add bear control within the next three years.

---

**Name:** Jordana Kearns

**Community of Residence:** Irvine, California

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75



PC1024

---

**Name:** Autumn Keller

**Community of Residence:** Gardiner, MT

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which



PC1025

aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1026

**Name:** Bradley Keller

**Community of Residence:** Liberty Township, OH

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75. The killing of that many predators would have terrible chain reaction consequences to the ecosystem. Ecosystems in wild places are one of the only remaining strongholds for combating global warming. Please do not move forward with this proposal.

---



PC1027

**Name:** Madi Kellum

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

#75, opposed, I oppose this proposal to reduce the population of bears and wolves because all wildlife needs to be preserved and protected at all cost.

---



PC1028

**Name:** Brian Kelly

**Community of Residence:** U.S.A

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

This is outrageous. The wild animals need their habitats preserved. These are lynchpin species and this will have an environmental snowball effect in the worst way. Not all development is good or necessary. Say No to the money and leave this beautiful piece of nature alone. Please stop!

---



PC1029

**Name:** Michael Kelly

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Oppose on proposition 75

---



PC1030

**Name:** Allison Kennedy

**Community of Residence:** Seattle, WA

**Comment:**

I am OPPOSING proposal 75 aka the unnecessary killing of bears and wolves.

---



PC1031

**Name:** Terry Kennedy

**Community of Residence:** Tenakee

**Comment:**

Predator Control Proposal 75

Against this proposal.

Because it seems not only cruel but research shows it doesn't work to strengthen moose populations (- so you can hunt more moose- this barely makes sense) Already wolf sightings are down in the area and people pay good money to see a wild wolf- this is a big economic boon for Alaska. Time and time again these kinds of "animal control programs" are proven to mess up the balance more than they help. Your research is showing the moose decline is more from diseases than wolfs.

---



PC1032

**Name:** Alexandra Kennedy

**Community of Residence:** British Columbia, Canada

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75.

---



PC1033

**Name:** Laurel Kent

**Community of Residence:** Tysons, Virginia

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

The proposed aerial gunning program borders some of the most iconic wildlife viewing areas in the world. Predator control is not popular with me or the general public. Authorizing this program on such loose and un-studied biological grounds bruises Alaska's image and erodes public faith in the Board of Game to make sustainable decisions.

I have been to Alaska 5 times – three of them to specifically see the bears. If this proposition passes, I will never visit Alaska again and will discourage others from visiting.

---



PC1034

**Name:** Nick Kernicky

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Prop 75 is an unreasonable measure, lacking empirical evidence to justify the population reduction of keystone species.

---



PC1035

**Name:** Meghan Keysboe

**Community of Residence:** Rogue county, or

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal number 75 and believe it is important to protect wildlife

---



PC1036

**Name:** Angie Kilpatrick

**Community of Residence:** Miamisburg

**Comment:**

Angie Kilpatrick

Proposal 75: opposed

With the state of the environment and global climate change, the last thing we need to be doing is killing predators for the sake of sport hunting. There been cruel behaviors in this sort of culling in the past and it is wholly unnecessary for the health of Alaska's ecosystem. By killing predators, smaller ungulates and herbivores are much more affected than moose and caribou.

---



PC1037

**Name:** Renee King

**Community of Residence:** Georgia

**Comment:**

Oppose #75

It's inhumane and the land was created to support the environment not human beings

---



PC1038

**Name:** Kelly Kinney

**Community of Residence:** san diego CA

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence.

Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---



PC1039

**Name:** Abigail Kirby

**Community of Residence:** San Jose

**Comment:**

I am opposing prop 75 because I do not want the usage of non-natural predators/shooting.

---



PC1040

**Name:** Darlene Kirk

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I vehemently oppose Proposal 75 with regards to barbaric population control of bears and wolves in Alaska. How absolutely stupid to suggest that is the way to control the population. You will forever changing the dynamic of wildlife and the ecosystem if you do this. Get a fricken clue on what makes Alaska special. It is its natural beauty and wildlife and you will be forfeiting tourism dollars. I vote NO!!!

---



PC1041

**Name:** Mitchell Kitt

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 has no positive outcome but only a tremendous loss in life of such a beautiful animal native to the area.

---



PC1042

**Name:** Carol Klamser

**Community of Residence:** Homer

**Comment:**

Re Proposal 75

I strongly oppose the plan to kill wolves and other predators in Game Management Unit 16. First of all, I don't think this will work and I oppose this tinkering with various populations to supposedly enhance other animal populations. The Board has a responsibility to manage wildlife for the benefit of ALL users in the state, not just sport hunters. These aerial hunting forays by the State always result in very bad publicity for the State of Alaska and I'm not convinced ADFG actually knows how these projects ultimately affect different populations. There is no shortage of moose in other areas of the state. Sport hunters can travel to the areas where moose are available.

---



PC1043

**Name:** Emma Klaustermeier

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I live in my RV and travel the national parks full-time, and I think reducing the brown bear population is abhorrent. It is the responsibility of every traveler and local to set themselves up for safety and security when in bear country, not for bears to be assassinated. Destroying the bear population is destroying any integrity this country has in its expressed care for wildlife and all of those who live in or around it. Leave the bears alone - we absolutely oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1044

**Name:** Greta Klein

**Community of Residence:** Austin

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is a terrible idea. There are better ways to manage populations and killing large numbers of important predators is not the answer.

---



PC1045

**Name:** Michael Knapp

**Community of Residence:** wasilla

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75 Iam opposed to any intensive management program policy or action taken by Dept of Fish and Game employees unless it simultaneously occurs with a lice eradication program .Having been the first trapper that caught licey wolves in unit 14B over 20 years ago and taken part in the lice eradication program back then,i see this proposal as nothing but killing wolves just to benefit moose hunters. The dept of Fish and game is supposed to manage all species of game for all user groups. If you bring the wolf numbers down 35 and leave one pack or a couple individuals with lice it does nothing to fix the problem of low public participation. Its a continuation of the state using my contribution of money for a short term solution that benefits no body but moose hunters and fails to eliminate the long term problem. They have done extensive lice wolf study's and eradication programs in the interior of alaska in the last 20 years, there is no reason they cant do both at the same time in unit 16

---



PC1046

**Name:** Lindsey Knepshield

**Community of Residence:** Seward

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 which is incredible government overreach and irresponsible wildlife management.

---



PC1047

**Name:** Brian Knerien

**Community of Residence:** Illinois

**Comment:**

Oppose Proposition 75

---



PC1048

**Name:** Tucker Knudsen

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

I am opposed to article 75 and the reducing of wolf and brown bear populations.

---



PC1049

**Name:** Brie Koerber-Miller

**Community of Residence:** Fenton

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: oppose!

IM objectives for unit 16

This is not conservation. This is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is lazy, irresponsible wildlife management in a place that deserves so much more care. Please, increase the hunting quotas on bears and wolves instead of slaughtering them. Hunting has a direct benefit to the community and is a big reason people travel to Alaska. Tourism to witness and/or hunt these animals are the biggest reason I see when people talk about traveling to Alaska. Removing such amazing animals in this way is ridiculous and un-american.

---



PC1050

**Name:** Susan Kohlstedt

**Community of Residence:** TN

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #75

---



PC1051

**Name:** Katelyn Kokeny

**Community of Residence:** Thornton, CO

**Comment:**

I'm commenting on proposal 75 to shoot all wolves and bears at Lake Clark in Alaska. I strongly oppose the killing of these animals.

---



PC1052

**Name:** Jake kolb

**Community of Residence:** East bethel minnesota

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is not the correct way to manage the population of bears and wolves in the region and has zero reason behind it. If I were Alaska Fish And Game and I wanted to reduce the population in that area open it up to hunting (conservation) and have a amount of tags that seems like a healthy amount of

animals to be taken and generate revenue through hunting and feeding and giving family's and hunters an opportunity to help you guys out. Not Gunning Them Down In HELICOPTERS

---



PC1053

**Name:** Elena Koloskova

**Community of Residence:** Seattle

**Comment:**

Proposal number 75. I OPPOSE! This is not the conservation but murder! Please leave the bears and wolves alone!

---



PC1054

**Name:** Mira Kovacic

**Community of Residence:** 1198 Venetian way, Miami, Fl

**Comment:**

I wholeheartedly oppose proposal 75, plans to gun down majestic wildlife, surrounding national parks. Wolves, brown and black bears. This way of population control is unacceptable, unethical, barbaric practice. Whatever reason for this proposal are, it is got to be a better way . Thank you

---



PC1055

**Name:** Karla Kozach

**Community of Residence:** Edinburg

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposition 75.

---



PC1056

**Name:** Brittany Kramer

**Community of Residence:** East Peoria

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Oppose

---



PC1057

**Name:** Brittany Kramer

**Community of Residence:** East Peoria

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - This is a cruel and senseless act of violence against innocent creatures! Alaska, we can do better than this. To gun down hundreds of bears and wolves from helicopters is not only inhumane but also environmentally destructive! These animals are vital to the delicate balance of the ecosystem. We cannot stand idly by while such a tragedy unfolds. Please, reconsider this proposal and choose compassion over cruelty.

---



PC1058

**Name:** Beth Kristiansen

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

Hi, oppose the culling and shooting of Alaska's wildlife, including bears and wolves! I strongly urge you to halt this proposal. Wildlife is more valuable alive than dead and killing these animals will alter the biodiversity of the area and cause more problems. I stroppose proposal 75

---



PC1059

**Name:** Danielle Kubicek

**Community of Residence:** Colorado USA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 OPPOSE. Wolves, bears, and other wildlife deserve better. It is ridiculous how much we are encroaching on their species. Let them live freely.

---



PC1060

**Name:** Cameron Kuhle

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing regarding BOG Proposal 75. I oppose this proposal. This type of predator control intensive management has not been shown to positively impact human harvests of moose and would be undertaken at great expense to the state.

---



PC1061

**Name:** Sydney Kump

**Community of Residence:** Salt Lake City Utah

**Comment:**

I am absolutely opposing to proposal 75. I am extremely concerned about the proposal for unit 16. This is an extremely lazy and irresponsible means to an end. Random aerial shooting instead of increased bear and wolf tags is robbing the area of the opportunity to see any economic benefit from the removal of a keystone species! This is a beautiful and magical place created by God. These animals are special and we must protect them! It is wrong to just be killing animals for no real good reason and letting them go to waist. This is such a shame and I'm extremely disappointed that this is even an option! Let natural selection happen, let hunters do their job, and stop killing precious animals just because!

---



PC1062

**Name:** Sally Kunckle

**Community of Residence:** United States of America

**Comment:**

Writing about proposal 75, I am oppose to the hunting of wild life. Animals deserve to live a full life. Please don't hunt them.

---



PC1063

**Name:** Leah Kundla

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal for 75: oppose! Absolutely uncalled for and disgusting to shoot down bears, wolves, etc. They are ANIMALS. Do we do this to humans when there are too many of us?! Stop destroying their land, let them live wild and free! This is America, right? You literally disgust me with this issue.

---



PC1064

**Name:** Alissa Kurke Bremer

**Community of Residence:** Maple Grove

**Comment:**

I appose proposal 75! Protect Alaska's wildlife. It is a disgusting a vile group of people who want to kill a living being for simply existing where they can. Mankind destroys and ruins enough of their habitat.

---



PC1065

**Name:** MaKenna Kurth

**Community of Residence:** Milwaukee

**Comment:**

I strongly opposed Proposal 75 and the unnecessary culling of wolves and bears. Humans are not God, and we need to stop acting as such and taking the lives of innocent creatures for our own sake. Mother nature knows what she's doing better than us!

---



PC1066

**Name:** Carol Kurtz

**Community of Residence:** Missouri

**Comment:**

As a frequent visitor to Alaska and a supporter of wildlife, I am appalled by the idea to hunt by plane.

If thinning needs to occur, let it benefit native populations.

I personally visit Alaska to see wildlife. I visited Katmai and I've watched the live cams there for years.

Don't destroy what makes your state so wonderful. No on 75.

---



PC1067

**Name:** Jenny L

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Oppose prop 75

---



PC1068

**Name:** Tristan La Haye

**Community of Residence:** Boulder

**Comment:**

I am saying NO to proposal 75. This would have astronomically bad ecological repercussions.

---



PC1069

**Name:** Pascale Laik

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

75/ oppose

seems to me very unfair and cruel to manage wildlife populations by gunning them from air... bears and wolfs are keystone species, + they are the symbols of Alaskan beautiful nature and wildlife, it's in my bucket list for a long time to travel to Alaska to see the bears in Katmai or Lake Clarke National Park, but this kind of wildlife management might make me change my mind as I don't agree with this way of treating wildlife, + I don't understand which such cruelty has to be employed

---



PC1070

**Name:** Dennis Lambect

**Community of Residence:** Martinez Georgia

**Comment:**

I opposed proposition 75 on the aerial shooting of brown bear north of Lake Clark National Park. I had the opportunity to visit Lake Clark in June 2024. The area and the wildlife must be preserved for future generations.

---



PC1071

**Name:** Kendra Lammers

**Community of Residence:** Downingtown,PA

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75 and the audial shooting of bears and wolvea

---



PC1072

**Name:** Gabriela Lana

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal Number 75: Oppose

And I oppose all hunting proposals.

I strongly oppose Proposal 75 submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) to grant sweeping authority for the aerial gunning of wolves and bears. This proposal represents a significant

escalation in wildlife management practices that could lead to the indiscriminate killing of these animals, disrupting the ecological balance and potentially leading to unforeseen environmental consequences.

Reasons for Opposition:

- **Ecological Impact:** Wolves and bears are apex predators that play a crucial role in maintaining the health of ecosystems. Their removal could lead to overpopulation of prey species, which might then overgraze or overhunt their food sources, leading to a cascade of ecological disruptions.

- **Ethical Considerations:** The method of aerial gunning raises serious ethical questions about the humane treatment of animals. It's a practice that many consider cruel and unnecessary, especially when alternative, less invasive methods of wildlife management exist.

- **Conservation Concerns:** Such aggressive control measures could threaten the conservation status of these species, especially if not carefully monitored. Bears and wolves are not only important for their roles in the ecosystem but also for their cultural and ecological significance.

- **Public Sentiment:** There is growing public opposition to such practices, with many advocating for non-lethal methods of wildlife management that can coexist with conservation efforts.

**Suggested Amendment:** If control is deemed absolutely necessary, I suggest amending the proposal to include strict regulations on when, where, and how these animals can be hunted, ensuring that it's done in a controlled, monitored, and humane manner. Additionally, non-lethal alternatives should be explored and prioritized.

Gabriela Madison Lana.

**Source:** This comment is based on general knowledge and public discourse surrounding wildlife management practices in Alaska. Specific sources for ecological and ethical arguments are widely available through conservation biology literature and public policy discussions.

---

**Name:** Grace Land

**Community of Residence:** Adair village

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Wildlife is so important and the killing of wolves is unnecessary

---



PC1073



PC1074

**Name:** Cotah Lane

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE Proposal 75 because we are not entitled the land we live in it was originally inhabited by the bears before us and WE are the ones or encroach into and onto their land, territory, and homes. They do not deserve to be subjectively killed because they have a higher population around humans.

---



PC1075

**Name:** Tamara Langham

**Community of Residence:** GA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is outrageous and despicable. Gunning down bears and wolves from the air is irresponsible and unethical.

---



PC1076

**Name:** Carleigh Lape

**Community of Residence:** Lebanon

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose proposal 75. The proposal to allow the mass killing of native Alaskan predators from aircraft is deeply concerning and raises serious ethical questions about wildlife management and conservation. Such an action not only reflects a troubling disregard for the delicate balance of ecosystems but also undermines the respect we owe to the natural world and its inhabitants.

The use of aircraft for hunting predators is not only inhumane but also an affront to the principles of sustainable wildlife management. It promotes a culture of violence and exploitation that contradicts efforts to preserve biodiversity and protect vulnerable species. Rather than addressing the root causes of any perceived issues with predator populations, this proposal resorts to extreme measures that could have devastating consequences for entire ecosystems.

Additionally, this approach disregards the importance of traditional ecological knowledge held by Indigenous communities, who have lived in harmony with these landscapes for generations. Their insights into the natural rhythms of wildlife and the interconnectedness of species should be valued and integrated into management practices, rather than being overshadowed by indiscriminate and brutal methods.

It is imperative that we advocate for more compassionate and scientifically sound approaches to wildlife management that prioritize coexistence, conservation, and respect for all living beings. The promotion of such an inhumane and reckless proposal only serves to deepen the divide between humans and nature, and it must be met with outrage and disapproval from all who care about the future of our planet.

---



**Name:** Karen Lapham

**Community of Residence:** Massachusetts

**Comment:**

Proposal #75 is wrong.

Innocent animals on land that belongs to them.

Humans interfere with nature far to often.

Please stop the cruel Killing of wild life. We destroy their land & kill them.

Do we treat unkind, murdering humans like that.

Stop killing nature. One day there will be none left.

Why can't we be the example of coexistence.

We can do better.

---



**Name:** Angela LaPlante

**Community of Residence:** Los Gatos, CA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposition 75. Vote NO!

---



**Name:** Leigha LaRoux

**Community of Residence:** Waupaca WI

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose of Proposal 75. We need to coexist with nature not destroy it, they don't deserve to die as they have every right to be here as we do.

---



PC1080

**Name:** Katelyn Larson

**Community of Residence:** Matsu valley

**Comment:**

I thoroughly oppose proposal 75. The proposal is based on an outdated form of wildlife management and is quite honestly a disgusting idea. Nobody in their right mind should approve of this expensive and poorly thought out proposal. Alaska is known for its beautiful natural expanses and this unfounded attack on predator species would decimate much of that natural beauty. Please refer to similar programs attempted in Yellowstone National Park for example. A predator culling program was introduced and instead of having the desired effect of increasing herbivore population to an even amount, those populations exploded to extremely high numbers resulting in severe over grazing. Over grazing results in destruction of natural vegetation and can cause mass starvation issues. Nature balances itself. It does not require our interference to sustain itself.

---



PC1081

**Name:** Ludovic Laus

**Community of Residence:** Belgium

**Comment:**

Good morning,

I object in the strongest possible terms to proposal 75, which I find extremely scandalous. How is it possible to show such cruelty and inhumanity to living beings? It also flies in the face of all common sense when it comes to the need to preserve biodiversity and the environment, which have suffered and continue to suffer so much destruction. So, please, give up this deadly proposal 75.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Ludovic Laus

---



PC1082

**Name:** Amicie Lavault

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

In the view of global biodiversity loss, shooting great numbers of bears is an aberration. Bears are predators that play important roles in the health of their environment.

As you must know, they spread seeds and participate in nutrient cycling, but also keep moose, caribou, and deer populations in check. Weakening our wildlife and ecosystems will have severe consequences and negative economical impacts.

I strongly oppose to the proposal 75 and demand that more responsible practices would be implemented instead.

---



PC1083

**Name:** Erin Lavery

**Community of Residence:** Santa Barbara, California

**Comment:**

I am a Yankton Sioux and Rosebud Sioux tribal member and I am opposed to prop 75. Please protect our wildlife and do not allow shooting of bears, wolves, etc. this causes unnecessary suffering of wildlife and is unethical and inhumane. This is a threat to the ecosystem and balance and there's a lack of transparency. Please do not pass this bill.

---



PC1084

**Name:** Mercy Lawler

**Community of Residence:** Georgia, USA

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose proposal 75 because it is not conservation; its aims can be accomplished by means that are more humane, and that benefit both the unique ecology of the area and those in surrounding communities. For example, hunting could achieve the same ends while helping individuals and communities. Aerially targeting bears is both cruel and wasteful. We have stolen their land enough already, this proposal is lazy and abhorrent. If we continue to destroy the land and creatures without thought of suffering and long term consequences they will no cease to exist. I oppose proposal 75 for all these reasons and more.

---



PC1085

**Name:** Nadja Lazansky

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

Prop 75: randomly shooting 75% of bears from planes does not seem like a well-thoughtout plan to lower populations. Collaborating on a plan with local communities would make more sense environmentalilly and economically.

---



PC1086

**Name:** Casandra Leach

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75 and feel this measure needs to be reconsidered, with the consideration of traditional ecological knowledge from native peoples as well as information from wildlife ecologists. Bears are an essential member of our ecological community and should not be removed for the sake of human comfort.

---



PC1087

**Name:** Jeff Lebegue

**Community of Residence:** Talkeetna

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

I oppose Department removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears in unit 16 for the following reasons:

1) Waste of state money.

The state is running out of money and should not be wasting money by paying state employees to do something hunters would gladly do. Hunters would pay big money to go into GMU 16 and harvest whatever.

2) Wonton waste.

The state employees kill big game and leave the whole carcass to rot. Bear meat, wolf pelt, all of it just is left to rot. Any ordinary person in this state that does that is fined and/or jailed. But the state doing it makes it OK? Hypocrites.

---



PC1088

**Name:** Kathy Lebron

**Community of Residence:** Westchester, NY

**Comment:**

I am writing to respectfully insist that Proposal 75 be killed in a like manner that it suggests so many natural predators of Alaska be killed! We cannot permit this slaughter of what should be protected wildlife. It would change the face of Alaska's wilderness. There are other ways to accomplish what the proposal's authors wish to achieve without such a brutal and costly approach.

I am asking for those who are involved to seriously reconsider this approach of decimating predatory wildlife and seek and find better solutions to their end goal. Thank you.

---



PC1089

**Name:** Elisa Lee

**Community of Residence:** Brooklyn

**Comment:**

OPPOSING PROPOSAL 75. Studies show that wildlife control does not boost moose populations for human harvest.

---



PC1090

**Name:** Brianne Lehan

**Community of Residence:** Gainesville, Florida

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75 -

Eliminating bears and wolves using state-owned aircraft is cruel, unnecessary, and does not promote a sustainable method of conservation of these populations with the wide sweeping random killing.

Instead, gradually increasing predator hunting tags over time would help prevent a boom and bust population cycle. Bear and wolf populations are fragile and rely heavily on family units. Wide spread heavy killing would certainly produce a bust, which could be detrimental and difficult for the survivors to come back from. And if they do and another boom occurs in years to come this is just a vicious cycle.

Slowly increasing bear and wolf hunting quotas over time could benefit local economies and bring additional funding to wildlife agencies

This is not conservation. This is not a decision made with the human or animal populations in mind. This is hugely irresponsible and shoves the best interests of our natural resources, economy, conservation, and animal welfare to the side.

These animal populations are already under the massive threat of mining development in the state. This alone could drastically change the bear and wolf populations in the coming years if this is to go through. We don't know enough about the mining situation, as if it happens the populations will likely be largely affected.

Both animals could be brought to the brink of localized extinctions in coming years with the extreme measure explained in this proposal and the potential for development infringing on bear/wolf habitats, salmon runs, and continued salmon decline.

So much can be lost due to careless measures such as this. I urge this to be stopped.

---



PC1091

**Name:** Holly Lehman

**Community of Residence:** Albuquerque new mexico

**Comment:**

#75. It's a threat to Ecosystem balance: wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. There is a lack of transparency and oversight granting unchecked powers to Alaska Fish and Game with no clear limits. No public accountability ending in indiscriminate killing. Will harm conservation efforts and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities. I oppose it

---



PC1092

**Name:** Laura Lehtola

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I strictly oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1093

**Name:** Victoria Leigh

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. It is unethical and sets a dangerous precedent. It is not ecologically sound. Defeat this barbaric proposal and close the door on ever considering it again.

---



PC1094

**Name:** Audrey LeMasters

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75. I have copied from AWA the following reasons why I am against this proposal.

“Alaska’s predator control programs — aimed at boosting moose, caribou, and deer populations for hunters — do not work to increase human moose harvest. A 2022 article by ADFG and University of Alaska Fairbanks biologists published in the scientific journal Diversity, found no increase in moose harvests in the years following nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska.”

“Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts and occurs without effective monitoring programs designed to scientifically evaluate impacts on predator populations, or identify causal relationships between predator control and prey population dynamics. Large carnivore management in Alaska should be based on rigorous science including the status and trends of carnivore populations - this program does not meet those standards. Read more in the 2019 article, Large carnivores under assault in Alaska, which was authored by three Alaska state and federal wildlife biologists.”

“The proposed aerial gunning program borders some of the most iconic wildlife viewing areas in the world. Predator control is not popular with the general public. The State’s reputation as a responsible wildlife manager is rightfully beginning to sour after aerially gunning down nearly 200 bears in southwestern Alaska. Authorizing this program on such loose and un-studied biological grounds bruises Alaska’s image and erodes public faith in the Board of Game to make sustainable decisions.”

“By ADFG’s own admission: “Adoption of this proposal would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities” (ADFG comments on Prop 75, Page 224). The Intensive Management program against bears and wolves a few hundred miles west cost \$231,000 in 2022 and \$612,000 in 2023 (page 14, 2024 annual report to Board of Game) Predator control as a whole has accounted for ~\$2.5 million in lost federal funding, as Pitman Roberts funds cannot be used for Intensive management. At a time when ADFG has almost no funding for non-game programs and the State is struggling for cash, it is unwise to dedicate another quarter million dollars each year to predator control programs that have yet to be deemed effective.”



PC1095

**Name:** Lee Ann Lentner

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Shooting bears and wolves from a helicopter is not ok. Not only are you affecting the “balance” of nature you are going to affect tourism. It has affected the bears in Katmai and this is so devastating and disgusting- stop this madness



PC1096

**Name:** Jessica Leptich

**Community of Residence:** Lake Stevens

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. America needs to care for it's wildlife, not kill it.

---



PC1097

**Name:** Shannon Lesovoy

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I am here to oppose Proposal 75. The disregard for life, animal or not, is atrocious and should never resort to forced violence. Please form a focus group of educated people on this matter for the most ecological and ethical solution to your problem. Investing money in violent drones should never be the answer. We all belong to this land. We cannot dictate who is allowed to live versus who isn't.

---



PC1098

**Name:** Lauren Levi

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Strongly oppose proposal 75. It would kill the wildlife that makes Alaska so valuable and hurt tourism and the communities that depend on it.

---



PC1099

**Name:** Sherry Lewis

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

I am commenting on proposal 75. I am against it and I'm encouraging the board of game to vote against it. Predator control at this scale is costly, does not work as intended, and in many cases props up arbitrary, unachievable population goals for moose in the name of hunter opportunity. Predator control has been shown to increase populations of caribou to such levels that they were eating up their food and had to be culled them selves in order that they don't starve to death. Predators are necessary for a healthy ecosystem. We don't want to have to pay a bunch of money to re-introduce predators like they did in Yellowstone.

Please vote against proposal 75. Thank you, Sherry.

---



**Name:** Lynne Lewis

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I am writing in OPPOSITION of Proposal 75. I am a wildlife economist and have published several papers on the value of brown bears in Alaska. Wildlife viewing in Alaska brings in millions of dollars and people travel from all over the world to see Alaska's iconic wildlife. This proposal is poor wildlife management and is a direct threat to the invaluable wildlife viewing of upper Cook inlet and elsewhere. The State needs to be responsible in wildlife management. There is no evidence that these predator control programs work to increase ungulate harvests.

For example, A 2022 article by ADFG and University of Alaska Fairbanks biologists published in the scientific journal Diversity, found no increase in moose harvests in the years following nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska.

Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts and occurs without effective monitoring programs designed to scientifically evaluate impacts on predator populations, or identify causal relationships between predator control and prey population dynamics. Large carnivore management in Alaska should be based on rigorous science including the status and trends of carnivore populations - this program does not meet those standards. Read more in the 2019 article, Large carnivores under assault in Alaska, which was authored by three Alaska state and federal wildlife biologists.

The proposed aerial gunning program borders some of the most iconic wildlife viewing areas in the world. Predator control is not popular with the general public. The State's reputation as a responsible wildlife manager is rightfully beginning to sour after aerially gunning down nearly 200 bears in southwestern Alaska. Authorizing this program on such loose and un-studied biological grounds bruises Alaska's image and erodes public faith in the Board of Game to make sustainable decisions.

By ADFG's own admission: "Adoption of this proposal would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities" (ADFG comments on Prop 75, Page 224). The Intensive Management program against bears and wolves a few hundred miles west cost \$231,000 in 2022 and \$612,000 in 2023 (page 14, 2024 annual report to Board of Game) Predator control as a whole has accounted for ~\$2.5 million in lost federal funding, as Pitman Roberts funds cannot be used for Intensive management. At a time when ADFG has almost no funding for non-game programs and the State is struggling for cash, it is unwise to dedicate another quarter million dollars each year to predator control programs that have yet to be deemed effective.

I am opposed to proposition 75

---



PC1101

**Name:** Amelia Lindell

**Community of Residence:** Haines

**Comment:**

If prop 75 is passed it will destroy several cornerstone species and hurt tourism as well. I oppose prop 75 because I love and care about bears and wolves. This is a lazy way to deal with the problem and you need to do better.

---



PC1102

**Name:** ce lindsey

**Community of Residence:** Although I reside in California and Oregon, I frequently visit Alaska and have a strong interest in preserving its wildlife and ecosystems.

**Comment:**

Name: C. E. Lindsey

Proposal Number: 75

Position: Oppose

Reasoning:

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which seeks to allow helicopter hunting of bears and wolves in Unit 16 to protect moose populations. This proposal raises significant ethical, ecological, and fiscal concerns:

**Fiscal Impact:** The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) acknowledges that implementing this proposal would incur substantial costs without demonstrated success. Similar efforts, such as those for the Mulchatna caribou herd, failed to show conclusive benefits despite considerable investment. Taxpayer money should not be wasted on ineffective and costly measures.

**Ethical Concerns:** Helicopter hunting is inhumane and contradicts the principles of fair chase that ethical hunting embodies. This method removes any chance for animals to escape or defend themselves, reducing them to defenseless targets and undermining respect for wildlife.

**Ecological Risks:** Bears and wolves are apex predators that play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance. Their removal could lead to overgrazing and vegetation loss, harming the moose populations this proposal seeks to protect. Disrupting predator-prey dynamics can result in long-term, irreversible damage to Alaska's ecosystems.

**Overlooked Alternatives:** Non-lethal methods, including habitat restoration, addressing human-related disturbances, and localized management practices, are proven to be more humane and effective. Additionally, addressing poaching, which ADFG acknowledges as a concern, would be a more targeted approach to managing moose populations.

Proposal 75 is an unsound, short-sighted measure that fails to prioritize ethical, sustainable, and fiscally responsible wildlife management. I urge the board to reject this proposal and consider alternative solutions that respect Alaska's wildlife and ecosystems.

---



PC1103

**Name:** Alison Litton

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles, CA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. I have never traveled to Alaska but when I think of the state, I think of its wildlife and knowing that the State of Alaska wants to gun down hundreds of bears and wolves from helicopters in an area that borders and partially encompasses not one but TWO National Parks is shocking. It saddens me to find out this is the management proposal. Alaska, you should do better than this. To gun down hundreds of bears and wolves from helicopters is not only inhumane but also environmentally destructive. These animals are vital to the delicate balance of the ecosystem. We cannot stand idly by while such a tragedy unfolds. Please, reconsider this proposal and choose compassion over cruelty. I would much rather visit Alaska to see wolves and bears - Alaska should look into ecotourism and conservation of wildlife and offer opportunities to preserve its wildlife rather than destroy it.

---



PC1104

**Name:** Tao Liu

**Community of Residence:** Fort Collins

**Comment:**

Opposition to Proposal 75

The proposed killing of Wolves and Bears is completely unnecessary and can have detrimental effects to local ecosystems, people and much more. Please reconsider this and please don't allow the unreasonable massacre of these keystone species and apex predators that are essential for a healthy ecosystem.

---



PC1105

**Name:** Kate Lloyd

**Community of Residence:** British Columbia, Canada

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal #75. These are outdated control tactics. Research has shown that this problem stems from human mismanagement of forestry and are the reason why caribou and deer populations are in decline, not because of natural predators. Fund and conduct proper research and management tactics, put animal lives first, not money.

---



PC1106

**Name:** Christine Loder

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. It is unethical and a waste of taxpayer money.

---



PC1107

**Name:** Diane Logan

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Fish and wildlife are to converse wild life. I ask that this proposal be stopped. I oppose Prop 75.

---



PC1108

**Name:** Matthew Lohrstorfer

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposal 75. I am a land and cabin owner and part-time resident of Unit 16. The last time I saw or even heard a wolf at my cabin at Shell Lake was about 13 years ago. Since then I've seen coyotes show up - an indicator that there are no wolves around. What I have seen is extremely deep snow years, moose running from snowmachines going 50 mph, exhausted and dying. I've seen a moose with a broken leg slowly die near my cabin for weeks with no predators around to kill it. I've seen multiple moose killed by trains and read accounts of hundreds more that have been killed by the Alaska Railroad. I've seen the number of moose killed by cars in the 100s on the sign on the highway. I've seen the need for wildfire for moose habitat. I've read multiple studies, some by the Department of Fish and Game themselves disputing the effectiveness of Intensive Management. And I've seen prey populations drop all across the state despite the near constant Intensive Management attempts. Ever wonder why that is? Perhaps we should heed the research. Predators kill the sick preventing the spread of disease, thereby strengthening prey populations. They kill the wounded, weak, old. There is a balance to the predator/prey relationship and IM throws it all out of whack. Thanks for listening.

---



PC1109

**Name:** Melissa Lomeli

**Community of Residence:** Dallas, TX

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75.

---



PC1110

**Name:** Becky Long

**Community of Residence:** Talkeetna

**Comment:**

12/23/24

Public Comment on the Alaska Board of Game Proposal 75

I DO NOT SUPPORT THE PREDATOR CONTROL EFFORTS IN UNIT 16 BY THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME STAFF TO KILL WOLVES AND BEARS.

I do not think that there is scientific evidence that predation is the main cause of the moose population decline. Predator control is very costly and does not usually work as intended. And in many cases, the moose population target is not achievable. Studies have shown that Alaska predator control do not increase human moose harvest. This is an outdated concept. Instead, there should be an effective monitoring program to scientifically evaluate if predation is indeed the cause. A review of population and harvest objectives needs to be done also. What about the quality of the moose habitat. Has the habitat changed to an extent that it affects the moose population survival? Changing climate impacts on habitat should be considered.

Also, if proposal 75 is approved, this means the Alaska Department of Fish and Game can develop Operational Predator Plans that are NOT open to public comment. I disagree with that impact.

Becky Long

---



PC1111

**Name:** Tim Lott

**Community of Residence:** TN

**Comment:**

I would like to OPPOSE Proposal 75, because it causes a significant manipulation of overall wildlife population. Historically, human alterations to wildlife populations have led to detrimental changes in the food chain and altered the landscape and weather pattern of an area. It is not our job to manipulate mother nature on a large scale like this!

---



PC1112

**Name:** Nicole Lucia

**Community of Residence:** San Diego

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - The passing of a bill to allow the killing of Alaska's bears and wolves via helicopter gunfire is a devastating blow to wildlife conservation and ethical hunting practices. This method is not only inhumane but also disrupts the delicate balance of Alaska's ecosystems, where these apex predators play a crucial role. Such indiscriminate killing undermines years of conservation efforts and tarnishes the natural beauty and biodiversity Alaska is known for. It is imperative to find sustainable solutions that respect the lives of these animals while addressing human-wildlife conflicts. We must reject this bill and advocate for methods that prioritize coexistence and the preservation of our natural heritage for future generations.

---



PC1113

**Name:** Nathan Luebbe

**Community of Residence:** Daybreak

**Comment:**

I am strongly opposed to Proposal 75. Predators are an important part of the ecosystem, and eliminating them so that humans have more herbivores to kill is disgusting.

Furthermore, bears viewing brings substantial tourism revenue to the state of Alaska, so this would be a financially disastrous move as well.

---



PC1114

**Name:** Bunni Lugosi

**Community of Residence:** Las Vegas, Nevada

**Comment:**

I am taking time out of my afternoon, on December 7th, 2024 to speak out on my opposition of Proposal 75. I am writing in from Las Vegas, as this has been brought to my attention.

If I can help stop proposal 75 from being enacted, I will.

Proposal 75 has no beneficial impact, as it is the forceful removal of wildlife from their habitat.

The inhumane killing of bears and wolves that Proposal 75 is protecting humans to do, rather than protecting the wildlife and the environment is something I cannot stand for — in any of my great States.

I am speaking out to OPPOSE Proposal 75.

---



PC1115

**Name:** Ashley Luke-Judycki

**Community of Residence:** Novi MI 48374

**Comment:**

Do not pass proposal 75. This would have a very negative impact on these species and their ecosystems.

---



PC1116

**Name:** Amanda Lumnah

**Community of Residence:** Massachusetts

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to Proposal 75. Alaska and the impacted area north of Lake Clark National Park. This area, regardless of its park service status, is a unique area of our country where bears thrive. Proposal 75 allows for a drastic reduction in brown bear populations that is unnecessary and detracts from all Alaska has to offer not just bears but the American, and especially Alaskan, community. With so few places left for brown bears to roam, let's continue to preserve them here by rejecting Proposal 75.

---



PC1117

**Name:** Declan Lustenberger, Lustenberger Family

**Community of Residence:** New jersey

**Comment:**

Proposal number 75, Opposing for unjust population control as it will be ecologically corrected via natural processes of nature, thus there is no need for human interference saving resources and lives.

---



PC1118

**Name:** Rebecca Lutz

**Community of Residence:** Valencia, PA

**Comment:**

Prop 75 absolutely oppose.

---



PC1119

**Name:** kim Ly

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence. Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---



PC1120

**Name:** Erin Lynch

**Community of Residence:** UT

**Comment:**

Oppose Proposal 75. Wildlife deserves to be protected.

---



PC1121

**Name:** Debbi Lynn

**Community of Residence:** Kamloops BC Canada

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal # 75; it is an absolutely inhumane way of solving any problem.

---



PC1122

**Name:** Ana M

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I vehemently oppose Proposal 75. The aerial culling of wolves and bears is inhumane and unnecessarily destructive to the environment. The killing of vital apex predators is not the answer.

If overpopulation is a concern, providing wolf and bear tags to in and out of state hunters is a more economical and ecologically sensible solution.

---



PC1123

**Name:** Holly Mabry

**Community of Residence:** SC

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose prop 75! There must be a better way.

---



PC1124

**Name:** Megan Macfarlane

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I am opposing the gun down of grizzly bears in unit 16. It is not the way to go about it. Grizzly population is already hurting. Please don't take this away from the animals who call unit 16 their home. I'm begging. I oppose proposal 75

---



PC1125

**Name:** Lactitia Magnin

**Community of Residence:** Neuchatel

**Comment:**

Protection of Wildlife. 1 number (75).... oppose to the proposition.

---



PC1126

**Name:** Julie Maher-Long

**Community of Residence:** New Hampshire

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposition 75. In these times of uncertainty of the stability of our planet and it's ecosystems you must err on the side of preservation of species, not hunter convenience.

---



PC1127

**Name:** Cody Majeres

**Community of Residence:** Virginia Beach

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose Proposal 75. I do not believe the measures outlined in the proposal offer a humane nor efficient solution to the issue. The biggest issue I have is not with the reason they need to remove these animals, however it's the fact that the proposal wants to do so aerially. I believe there's better options to go about this situation than the proposal submitted and do not agree with this submission.

---



PC1128

**Name:** John Malanowski

**Community of Residence:** Nashville

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I oppose because it is just wrong to kill a living thing and it will greatly affect the region as a tourist destination with a decline in the wolf and bear population. I'm changing my plans to visit your state if this is passed.



PC1129

**Name:** Charlotte Malaroche

**Community of Residence:** New Jersey

**Comment:**

Strongly oppose proposal 75. Save the bears.

---



PC1130

**Name:** Mady Malloy

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Opposition to Proposal #75

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal #75 and to urge the Board to deny this measure during your January 2025 meeting in Wasilla. This proposal raises significant ecological, ethical, and cultural concerns that, if approved, would undermine the balance of Alaska's wildlife management practices and potentially harm the state's rich biodiversity and community interests. Below, I will outline several critical reasons why Proposal #75 should not move forward.

#### 1. Threat to Alaska's Biodiversity

Proposal #75 poses a direct risk to the ecological balance that sustains Alaska's diverse wildlife populations. Alaska's ecosystems are delicately interconnected, with predator and prey dynamics ensuring stability within habitats. The implementation of this proposal could disrupt these dynamics, leading to unintended and potentially irreversible consequences.

For instance, if this proposal involves increased harvesting or the targeting of a specific species, it risks creating a cascading effect across the food web. Predators, prey, and plant communities depend on one another to maintain a balanced ecosystem. Overharvesting or population reduction of a single species, even temporarily, can lead to overpopulation of prey species, habitat degradation, and subsequent declines in other critical populations. This destabilization could affect not only wildlife but also the subsistence and recreational hunting opportunities for Alaskans who rely on sustainable populations.

#### 2. Conflict with Sound Wildlife Management Principles

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game prides itself on science-based wildlife management practices, ensuring that regulations are grounded in research and long-term sustainability. Proposal #75 appears to deviate from these principles, favoring short-term gains over ecological stewardship.

Wildlife management decisions should prioritize data-driven strategies that balance the needs of wildlife populations, hunters, and the broader ecosystem. Approving this proposal would set a dangerous precedent, undermining public trust in the Board's commitment to science-based policies. It is crucial that the Board adhere to its guiding principles and reject any measures that compromise sustainability or prioritize special interests over public benefit.

### 3. Potential Ethical Violations

Ethical considerations must also play a role in wildlife management decisions. Alaska's wildlife is a shared resource, belonging not only to current generations but to future Alaskans as well. Proposal #75 may encourage practices that many Alaskans and wildlife enthusiasts would consider unethical, such as excessive harvesting or exploitation of vulnerable species.

Public perception of wildlife management practices matters greatly, especially in a state renowned for its natural beauty and commitment to conservation. Adopting measures perceived as unethical could harm Alaska's reputation, alienating stakeholders such as conservation organizations, indigenous communities, and ecotourism operators who play a vital role in the state's economy and culture.

### 4. Negative Impact on Subsistence Users

The proposal could disproportionately harm Alaska Native communities and other subsistence users who rely on sustainable wildlife populations for their livelihoods and cultural practices. Wildlife is more than a resource; it is a cornerstone of many indigenous traditions and ways of life. Policies that prioritize non-subsistence uses or overharvesting threaten this delicate balance and could deprive these communities of their right to continue their cultural heritage.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and state law both mandate the protection of subsistence hunting and fishing rights. Proposal #75 may run counter to these mandates, undermining the state's obligation to prioritize subsistence users. This conflict alone warrants serious reconsideration of the proposal.

### 5. Public Opposition and Lack of Consensus

Wildlife management policies should reflect the values and interests of all Alaskans, not just a select few. Proposal #75 has already generated significant public concern, with many stakeholders opposing its potential consequences. Public testimony, letters, and local community input often reveal a broad consensus against proposals that could harm wildlife populations or compromise ethical standards.

The Board should take this public opposition seriously. Ignoring widespread concerns risks alienating constituents and creating a divide between policymakers and the public. Wildlife is a shared resource, and decisions regarding its management should prioritize collective benefit over individual gain.

### 6. Legal and Administrative Concerns

Finally, Proposal #75 could expose the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to legal and administrative challenges. If the proposal conflicts with federal laws, state statutes, or established wildlife management principles, it could lead to costly litigation and a loss of public confidence in the Board's decision-making process. The Board should carefully consider the legal ramifications of approving this measure and err on the side of caution.

### Conclusion

Alaska's wildlife is one of its greatest treasures, sustaining ecosystems, economies, and cultures for generations. Proposal #75 represents a step backward in our collective efforts to preserve this legacy. By prioritizing short-term objectives over long-term sustainability, it threatens the very foundations of Alaska's wildlife management system.

I urge the Alaska Board of Game to reject Proposal #75 and instead focus on measures that enhance conservation efforts, protect biodiversity, and uphold the values of sustainability, equity, and ethical

stewardship. This decision will demonstrate the Board's commitment to preserving Alaska's natural heritage for current and future generations.

Thank you for considering my comments. I trust that the Board will make the right decision to protect Alaska's wildlife and the communities that depend on it.

Sincerely,

Mady Malloy

---



PC1131

**Name:** Megan Maloney

**Community of Residence:** Beverly Hills, MI

**Comment:**

On proposal 75:

OPPOSE. I oppose this proposal because it is not using sound logic or efficient reasoning. If it is biologically indicated for a reduction of predators in this area it makes no sense to randomly cull animals from aircraft with no direct benefit to the people and communities of Alaska. If appropriate, predators should be reduced via hunting permits open to the public via lottery system or otherwise. The current proposal offers no benefit to the communities of Alaska through revenue gained by hunters traveling and lodging in the state. Additionally the number of animals culled seems abnormally high, it can't be viable for populations to reduce almost 80%, I fear for genetic variability in these populations. These populations are under direct threat and pressure by nearby mining interests, decreased salmon run numbers, and exist in one of the last pristine habitats for their species. I directly oppose this bill as a taxpaying American citizen.

---



PC1132

**Name:** Madison Marek

**Community of Residence:** Peterborough Nh

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: cruel and wrong

---



PC1133

**Name:** Christian Marin

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75!

---



PC1134

**Name:** Daniel Markos

**Community of Residence:** Hamilton, MA

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75

---



PC1135

**Name:** Chloe Marletta

**Community of Residence:** Manchester by the Sea

**Comment:**

I am opposing to proposal number 75 because brown bears are already under extreme threat from the development of the Johnson Tract Mine, by collapsing silver salmon mines. Instead of increasing bear and wolf hunting quotas which could have directly benefited local economies and brought additional funding to wildlife agencies, they are requesting the ability to eliminate bears and wolves using ariel shooting by using state-owned aircraft, instead they should gradually increase predator hunting tags to prevent boom and bust cycle.

---



PC1136

**Name:** Kelsey Martin

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Please protect the bears and wolves of Alaska. I oppose gunning them down via helicopter and culling the herds. prop 75

---



PC1137

**Name:** Holly Martin

**Community of Residence:** Illinois

**Comment:**

I recommend rejecting Proposal 75. The proposed hunt to cull a significant population of wolves and bears would be fiscally irresponsible given scientific proof over many studies that this does not benefit target populations in the long run. Find another way to address concerns about decreases in moose and caribou herds. Bears and wolves are not the root cause of the problem.

---



PC1138

**Name:** Fabio Martinez Parra

**Community of Residence:** Spring, TX

**Comment:**

I oppose to proposal #75. Killing innocents wild animals to meet the greed of few hunters, it is not a wise way to management ecosystems.

---



PC1139

**Name:** Simone Marx

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: Oppose!

Studies have shown that Alaska's predator control programs — aimed at boosting moose, caribou, and deer populations for hunters — do not increase human moose harvest.

Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts and occurs without effective monitoring programs designed to scientifically evaluate impacts on predator populations or identify causal relationships between predator control and pre-population dynamics.

If approved, this proposal would give ADFG full reign to implement an aerial gunning plan in Unit 16. Once a proposal like this is approved, ADFG has the authority to develop an Operational Plan for aerial gunning that is not open to public comment.

---



PC1140

**Name:** Sarah Mather

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage/Seattle

**Comment:**

Please say no to Proposal 75. It would be an embarrassment to the state. It fundamentally misunderstands wildlife management purposes and goals (intentionally?) and has every appearance of pure laziness. It will make the state look like a bunch of backward hicks drunkenly shooting magnificent wild animals from the comfort of a helicopter and attract every possible environmental organization to our doorsteps, changing voter dynamics and making it even more difficult for public officials to do legitimate wildlife conservation work. It will also put the fisheries at risk of the same spotlight, which would cost the state millions.

Just leave the damn bears and wolves alone and tell people to secure their trash and stock. Nature will balance the animal population without the need for these antics that risk so many Alaskan jobs.

---



PC1141

**Name:** Maureen Matsen

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy. Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence. Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---



PC1142

**Name:** Daria Mattly

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Please don't kill the bears

---



PC1143

**Name:** Patrick Maurice

**Community of Residence:** Athens, GA

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75 because I work in the ecotourism industry and killing so many predators is bad for the ecology here and negatively impacts the tourism industry. The tourism industry supports the local economy and jobs in Alaska, so we need to continue to support that.

---



PC1144

**Name:** Debra May

**Community of Residence:** Tacoma Washington

**Comment:**

This is in reference to proposal 75 purging your brown bear population. I am extremely opposed to any kind of free-for-all hunting of brown bears. They were here long before us and if you manage correctly they will be here long after we're

Concerned American citizen

Debra May

---



PC1145

**Name:** Ryan May

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year. According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence. Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ryan May

---



PC1146

**Name:** Sara Mayako

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I, along with so many others, vehemently oppose Proposal 75. It is an egregious proposal that is unfounded and completely detrimental to the community and the ecosystem at large. We can not allow for more inhumane killings of our wildlife.

---



PC1147

**Name:** Genevieve Mayrer

**Community of Residence:** Columbus

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. We must preserve wildlife and the biodiversity of our nation and not deplete it further. If anything, we should better equip citizens with knowledge on wildlife and how to protect themselves in encounters with these animals, fostering coexistence rather than destruction. Reducing populations to such extreme levels is not only unnecessary but disrupts the delicate balance of ecosystems that these species help maintain. I urge you to reconsider this approach and prioritize conservation efforts that reflect our shared responsibility to protect the natural heritage of Alaska for future generations.

---



PC1148

**Name:** Susan McCaffrey

**Community of Residence:** State of Maine

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - I oppose this proposal as a conservationist and environmentalist. We must carefully maintain the balance of predators in our environment. They control prey species which in turn controls damage to vegetation. Large predators also bring tourism dollars into otherwise remote locations. This proposal should not be enacted.

---



PC1149

**Name:** Teresa McCartney

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Oppose

This a cruel and inhumane practice and everyone responsible for the proposal should be ashamed of themselves. It also happens to be an inefficient method of population control.

---



PC1150

**Name:** Mitchell McClosky

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose amendment 75 meant to decrease the population of predators in Alaska.

---



PC1151

**Name:** Erin McCloy

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: As an Animal Control Officer in CO, I believe it is vital to let these animals live peacefully in their natural habitats to prevent extinction and drastic changes to the ecosystems. I oppose this proposal.

---



PC1152

**Name:** Shawna McCown

**Community of Residence:** Rush, Kentucky

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75.

Allowing innocent animals to be murdered to maintain a healthy ecosystem is ignorant and lazy. Anyone proposing this should not be in a position powerful enough to make this decision, because they are ignorant, dangerous, and grotesquely under qualified to be managing wildlife. Absolutely abhorrent and I even suggest.

---



PC1153

**Name:** Laurin McCoy

**Community of Residence:** Iowa

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. We need to protect these animals and our environment.

---



PC1154

**Name:** Whitney McCoy

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I urge you to OPPOSE Proposal 75, which would allow aerial gunning and other lethal methods to kill wolves and other wildlife near Alaska's national parks. This practice would be incredibly detrimental to the wildlife that is the pride of these parks and the surrounding areas. This would lead to unconscionable slaughter of various species contrary to the spirit of the legal protections currently in place. Thank you for your consideration.

---



PC1155

**Name:** Samantha McDaniel

**Community of Residence:** Cincinnati

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is unethical slaughter.

Reducing the population of brown bears is going to have a negative impact on the local ecosystem.

Predators play an extremely important role in that ecosystem and proposal 75 will destroy that balance!

---



PC1156

**Name:** Samantha McKain

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state. Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year. According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1157

**Name:** Mandi McKenzie

**Community of Residence:** Grand Haven

**Comment:**

proposal #75- i am opposed to it. there's no reason that we should be hunting wildlife especially, if it's just for sport.

---



PC1158

**Name:** Sean McNabb

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75. The wolves and bears should be allowed to remain undisturbed. I've visited this area and have appreciation for these animals and they should be cherished not slaughtered.

---



PC1159

**Name:** Melanie McNally

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. This is not conservation. This is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is lazy, irresponsible wildlife management in a place that deserves so much more care.

---



PC1160

**Name:** nina mcnitzky

**Community of Residence:** oregon

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 OPPOSE

we are decimating the american wilderness by killing off keystone species/predators to the point in which the ecosystem will not bounce back--there is a reason europeans come here to see wilderness because wild predators have largely been killed off and tame organized gentile hunts/adventures are all thats now possible--australia killed off most of the land based predators so insects/crocs/reptiles are the main wildlife predators--is this the future you want for alaska? i do not hunt, i barely camp, i go on the occasional tourist wildlife trips... but even i can see that eradicating/losing these species will forever change the tourism of alaska and maybe even make it into a miniature golf version of wild-like viewing where true wilderness once existed.

---



PC1161

**Name:** Emily Mcrae

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I am writing against prop 75

Alaska is one of the last wild states and that needs to continue. One of the biggest reasons people come here to visit and live is for the freedom of the people and the wildlife viewing. You start taking away the wildlife and you lose visitor. You put a bad name on Alaska in terms of slaughtering animals for no reason. These bears belong here just as much as the people. These people who are citizens want their freedom and so do the animals. Keep Alaska wild and free. People know the threat of wild animals, that's not valid for "peoples safety". Respect nature and Alaskans know that. Don't turn into the commie state of Cali where they think they know best, take away peoples rights, and have no regard for life.

---



PC1162

**Name:** Tori Meadows

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 for the unlawfulness of gunning down these animals in a protected National Park. It's protected for a reason, and to do what is proposed is anti-environmental and inhumane.

---



PC1163

**Name:** Shelby Medlock

**Community of Residence:** Louisiana

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75 because bears and wolves are a keystone species in this area and are vital to the Lake Clark ecosystem. Furthermore, removal of these animals decreases the influx of tourism dollars from wildlife viewing and photography. I strongly oppose this proposition.

---



PC1164

**Name:** Karla Mejia

**Community of Residence:** Santa clarita, ca

**Comment:**

Please reject proposal 75. It is our responsibility to maintain/protect the balance of our ecosystem along with holding humane practices. This proposal to do aerial killings of wolves and bears is not only inhumane but it will contribute to the extinction of these animals just for sport. We have to continue to hold humanity at its highest bar, not to regress to having no regard for life. As a follower of God, this proposal is sinful with the purpose of only to kill for joy and greed. Please oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1165

**Name:** Julie Mellin

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

I am against proposal 75. It doesn't appear the evidence shows there actually is a population problem - and if there were, why not offer hunting tags instead of spending public funds?

---



PC1166

**Name:** Ola Melman

**Community of Residence:** Germany

**Comment:**

Proposal 75:

This is a barbaric mass murder of lots of animals.

---



PC1167

**Name:** Kathleen Menke

**Community of Residence:** Haines

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. State predator control. Opposed.

I photographed wolves in Denali for six seasons while the Park still had both healthy wolf populations and prey populations. My background and training is in biology/ecology.

Wolves have families. Predator control programs, particular extreme predator control programs, disrupt the genetic and cultural training in wolf populations that is achieved through their family dynamics. They play, they hunt, they care for each other. They limit their own populations based on territory and habitat available.

Moose and wolves have evolved together for thousands of years and these populations keep each other healthy.

Predator control programs are brutal and cruel, expensive, and ineffective over the long-term.

Control humans. Regulate human hunting. Protect habitat. Leave the wolves alone. Bears also.

---



PC1168

**Name:** Ruby Merdinger

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 . I think you should increase hunting opportunities instead of just killing for population control .

---



PC1169

**Name:** Kiersten Mertig

**Community of Residence:** Maryland

**Comment:**

I am urging you to oppose proposal 75. Grizzly and wolves are keystone species that the environment cannot thrive without. If you remove that much of the population then there's a good chance the moose population you seek to protect will end up collapsing due to the resulting population boom. The moose population having a bad year isn't reason to get rid of that much of the predator population. Read Aldo Leopold's "The Green Fire"

---



PC1170

**Name:** Adam Meyer

**Community of Residence:** America

**Comment:**

No to prop 75. We must not allow for the mass killing of of our most iconic species.

---



PC1171

**Name:** Brynsley Michael

**Community of Residence:** Seattle

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: OPPOSE

I am deeply disappointed that this proposal is being considered a “solution.” It reflects the pervasive corruption within our Fisheries and Wildlife departments and government. Once again, we are failing our nation’s wildlife. We are failing to coexist, to recognize the intrinsic value of these species, and to understand that eradicating wildlife is not what’s best for our society or our planet.

There is no credible scientific evidence supporting this approach. On the contrary, this proposal demonstrates that those tasked with protecting and managing wildlife often view these animals as problems to be eliminated—a barbaric and outdated mindset. These are sentient beings with complex emotions, family bonds, and critical roles in maintaining ecological balance. Predators are not pests; they are keystone species essential for healthy ecosystems.

I strongly suspect that this proposal is being driven by special interests, such as hunters and organizations that stand to profit from the destruction of these vital species. This is unacceptable. We must do better. We must demand ethical, science-based solutions that prioritize coexistence and respect for all life.

---



PC1172

**Name:** Ellie Miles

**Community of Residence:** Scotland

**Comment:**

Proposal 75.

Oppose.

Unnecessary suffering for the animals.

---



PC1173

**Name:** Giana Miller

**Community of Residence:** Monroeville

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1174

**Name:** Morgan Miller

**Community of Residence:** Pittsburgh

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Leave the animals alone. Alaska is known for its wildness leave it that way! As somewhere I have always dreamed to visit if this proposal becomes a reality I'll never visit a state that supports something like this!

---



PC1175

**Name:** Elizabeth Miller

**Community of Residence:** Chamblee, GA

**Comment:**

My opposition to Proposal 75

This proposal is in one word - unethical. First, the use of aerial "hunting" (really slaughter) of any animal is barbaric and should be banned. This is not what hunting is and certainly in no way what hunting should become in the future. Using such means to slaughter ANY wildlife truly demonstrates a disconnect with what wildlife management should be which should include only ethical hunting practices. Beyond that the objectives for the goal to kill numbers are excessive. Killing 70% of the wolf population is not management but is just mass slaughter. I urge you to please consider other means to achieve a more reasonable goal.

---



PC1176

**Name:** Eli Miller

**Community of Residence:** TN

**Comment:**

I oppose of proposal 75

---



PC1177

**Name:** Ilene Kastel, Mindfully Modern Therapy

**Community of Residence:** Lake Tomahawk

**Comment:**

75 - no shooting of bears or wolves

---



PC1178

**Name:** Tess Minter

**Community of Residence:** Arizona

**Comment:**

against prop 75. dont kill wildlife.

---



PC1179

**Name:** Haydee Luz Misas

**Community of Residence:** Houston, Texas

**Comment:**

I oppose to proposal #75. I don't want my taxes supporting a wildlife massacre.

---



PC1180

**Name:** Cali Mitchell

**Community of Residence:** Nome

**Comment:**

Opposing proposal number 75. Bear and wolf culls are relatively unrelated to the decline in caribou populations.

---



PC1181

**Name:** Donna Mitchell

**Community of Residence:** Atlanta GA

**Comment:**

These actions have devastating consequences on predator populations, ecosystems, and wildlife balance.

A similar 2022 predator control program has already led to the killing of nearly 100 bears in just the first month—despite assurances to the public that bear control wouldn't be a part of these actions.

**Inhumane and Unethical Methods:** Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

**Threat to Ecosystem Balance:** Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

**Lack of Transparency and Oversight:** Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

**Conservation and Economic Risks:** Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities.

This proposal is an outrage.

---



PC1182

**Name:** Carol Mitchell

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Opposed to 75

---



PC1183

**Name:** Katerina Miziuk

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: Opposed. This proposal is inhumane and the strategies outlined in it lack any scientific basis. Many studies reveal that predators are not the major factor determining game animal population. Game animal populations are also influenced by habitat quality, food availability, and environmental conditions. Eliminating predators does not address these factors.

Removing such a large proportion of a predator species can have cascading ecological consequences in a complex ecosystem such as this, leading to unintended consequences. Furthermore, other predator species such as wolves, lynx and coyotes may fill the void left by removal of predators stated in proposal 75.

These predators have slow reproductive rates and rely on large, intact ecosystems. Thus a significant reduction in bear populations could threaten their long-term viability, putting the ecosystem at risk.

A more effective approach should involve enhancing habitat quality, minimizing human disturbance, and using science-based wildlife management plans that consider the ecological role of all species.

---



PC1184

**Name:** Tristen Moffett

**Community of Residence:** Jackson hole

**Comment:**

I Oppose Proposal 75. These creatures are meant to be in the Ecco system today and for future generations. Mass killing these animals by humans is so incredibly wrong.

---



PC1185

**Name:** Aurore Molaie

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Comment on the Proposal 75, which would allow aerial gunning and other lethal methods to kill wolves and other wildlife near Alaska's national parks.

We strongly oppose the Proposal here above mentioned.

Wolves are essential wildlife for the biodiversity and cannot be killed just to please farming lobbies or other political interests.

We ask the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to cancel this awful proposal.

Best regards

Aurore MOLAIE

---



PC1186

**Name:** Holly Monahan

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposition 75

---



PC1187

**Name:** Sandra Montalbo

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

This is insane and I oppose bill 75. Do better and protect wildlife.

---



PC1188

**Name:** Sam Moore

**Community of Residence:** Topeka

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: I strongly oppose this proposal. Grizzly bears are very slow to reproduce and are a keystone species of healthy ecosystems. Research has shown killing predators, has limited affect on increasing ungulate populations, and most of the problem lies with over harvest by humans. We have no business poking around in complex ecosystems we are in no way close to fully comprehending. We allowed the government to manage the bison and the wolves, lesson learned. How little we have apparently learned. On top of that bears are sentient beings and you would even entertain a proposal of mass indiscriminate killings is disgusting, especially for no more important reason than selling more game tags. I strongly oppose this and any aerial gunning of wolves as well.

---



PC1189

**Name:** Mecca Moore

**Community of Residence:** Brooklyn Park

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to Proposal 75. Ariel hunting for predator control is not appropriate management of this situation. I recommend that you:

1. Increase hunting quotas to meet the need. By doing so, if you will not only control the predator population, but you will also create revenue for a local industries.
  2. Consult members of the local communities and industries, listen to their suggestions, and make an honest effort to apply what you learn from them.
  3. Do not move forward with Proposal 75. It is large-scale mismanagement and reflects poorly on your agency.
- 



PC1190

**Name:** Marie Moore

**Community of Residence:** Ontario, Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - OPPOSE

Supporting this proposal is short sighted and is based on outdated and ineffective practices. Damaging wildlife populations in Alaska also affects neighboring provinces that aren't given a say in environmental impacts.

Your choices affect Canadian wildlife as well and this proposal should be given proper consideration based on what is best for all life, including the animals.

---



PC1191

**Name:** Betty Moose

**Community of Residence:** Silver Spring

**Comment:**

The bears are innocent. How dare you suggest kill them. If we keep treating humans as supreme in this way, god help us, for there will be nothing to help or comfort us after we desecrate our home and it's creatures. I am opposed to proposal 75.

---



PC1192

**Name:** Emily Mora

**Community of Residence:** Arcata, California

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is absolutely absurd and should not be passed.

---



PC1193

**Name:** Athila Morales

**Community of Residence:** Dallas

**Comment:**

My name is Athila Morales from Dallas, TX and this is in regards to proposal 75. I am HIGHLY opposed and honestly disgusted, as this proposal serves absolutely no purpose. Well, besides letting folks go trigger happy on unsuspecting animals. If you insist in culling animals, at the very least make it make sense. Allowing local individuals gradually to get more tags to cull the species of choice in an ethical way that can give way for more resources to be used and monetary gain for the state. Hunting to hunt is medieval and ignorant. Hunting from the air is lazy and should be illegal. Ethical hunters, hunters who respect the land, and animals, are not in the business of supporting practices that should have been left in history books as mistakes made by the so called "top of the food chain" predator. Do better for your state, your citizens and America.

---



PC1194

**Name:** Katherine Moreman

**Community of Residence:** Birmingham, Alabama

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: I oppose this proposal. Bears and wolves are an important part of the ecosystem. They also can bring in tourism and help the local economy through wildlife tours and promoting conservation and safety awareness of these creatures. Please protect them!

---



PC1195

**Name:** Taylor Morenk

**Community of Residence:** Fl

**Comment:**

75

---



PC1196

**Name:** Jessica Morgan

**Community of Residence:** Tucson, AZ

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposition 75, which would expand the use of aggressive predator control measures in Alaska. This proposal continues a troubling pattern of failed wildlife management practices that undermine the ecological balance of our state.

History has shown that intensive reductions of predator populations, such as bears and wolves, fail to achieve the intended benefits for prey species like moose and caribou. Numerous studies of past efforts have demonstrated little to no long-term success. These simplistic approaches overlook the complexity of ecosystems, which cannot be managed with one-dimensional strategies.

Moreover, predator control disrupts the natural balance of Alaska's wilderness. Bears play a vital role in maintaining healthy ecosystems by dispersing seeds, aerating soil, and regulating prey populations. Overmanaging these predators risks destabilizing ecosystems, triggering cascading effects that harm other wildlife and the environment as a whole.

These programs are not only ecologically damaging but also economically wasteful. Millions of dollars have been spent on similar initiatives with little accountability or measurable success. Proposition 75 threatens to repeat these mistakes, diverting resources from more effective strategies like habitat restoration and scientific research—approaches proven to support wildlife populations sustainably.

---



PC1197

**Name:** Dexter Morgan

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

Killing wildlife in area of 2 National Parks is ridiculous and outraging. This cruelty shall not be allowed.

---



PC1198

**Name:** Michelle Moritz

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Please don't implement Proposal 75, which will lead to decimation of bears and wolves and great disturbance of the ecosystem through indiscriminate and inhumane culling of these apex species.

---



PC1199

**Name:** Nanette Morozumi

**Community of Residence:** Victor, Montana

**Comment:**

Oppose Proposal 75! This is simply unethical and inhumane! It will not only be a slaughter innocent life, but as we have learned in Montana knowingly create an unbalanced ecosystem. Special interest groups don't deserve the destruction of our wildlife for the specific benefit of themselves. I would certainly hope the Alaska continues to protect wildlife for the benefit of all of its inhabitants, human and animal.

---



PC1200

**Name:** Emilija Morris

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Objection to proposal 75 due to its inhuman proposition

---



PC1201

**Name:** Arthur Morris

**Community of Residence:** Homer, Alaska

**Comment:**

Regarding proposal 75 5AAC92.112

I strongly oppose the intensive management plan to lethally remove wolves and bears utilizing Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game personnel, equipment and federal monies. Aerial shooting and lethal removal is cruel and indiscriminate. It causes unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight. Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game with no clear limits, oversight or public accountability. Bears and wolves play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

I strongly oppose Prop 75 and ask the board to consider likewise.

Respectfully,

Arthur M

---



PC1202

**Name:** Chris Morris

**Community of Residence:** San Diego

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in your beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems.

Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence.

Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

- Chris Morris

---



**Name:** Marlowe Moser

**Community of Residence:** Port Townsend Washington

**Comment:**

I am writing to encourage Board members to oppose Proposition 75. I understand that human and wildlife conflict, especially when it comes to apex predators, is a cause for grave concern. In recent years, my community in Washington state has experienced many encounters between people and livestock with wild cougars as human development increasingly overlaps with the cougars' habitat. Much work is being done by the Olympic Cougar Project to study cougar populations and to research how humans can adapt to reduce risky encounters with them — for example, by constructing nighttime livestock shelters that deter attacks. Brown bears are obviously another large predator that pose great potential risk to human communities when the two overlap, the bears' boldness and curiosity posing a uniquely scary problem. Unfortunately, most of North America's remaining healthy populations of brown bear are now restricted to Alaska, as the range of brown bears has been drastically reduced since the 1800s. Brown bears play critical roles in their ecosystems by maintaining healthy populations of prey animals and cycling nutrients between marine and terrestrial environments. If healthy, genetically diverse populations in Alaska are lost, then the health of Alaska's game populations and forests are compromised as well. Instead of directing resources toward a reactive proposal to cull the brown bear population, I instead urge you to implement a similar initiative to what the Olympic Cougar Project is doing here in Washington. For the health of Alaska's valuable natural resources now and in the future, please vote no on Proposition 75.

---



PC1204

**Name:** Dan Moseson

**Community of Residence:** Salt Lake City, UT

**Comment:**

The proposal to expand shooting of bears and wolves from helicopters in Lake Clark National Park (Proposal 75) is a bad look. The text of the proposal doesn't even mention a reason for shooting bears.

---



PC1205

**Name:** Ireene Moul

**Community of Residence:** Atlanta, Georgia

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75.

I oppose killing wolves. They do not harm any one, since Alaska has no livestock ranch, at least not where you propose to do airborne hunting. Wolves do not reduce ungulate population, they take only weak, sick or old prey animal, thus keep herd healthy. When human intervene and reduce the number of wolves, result in overpopulation of ungulate and result in the increased number of CWD afflicted ungulate animals and eventually result in their extinction. I believe letting the nature take care of biological diversity is the best way for all wildlife and our environment.

---



PC1206

**Name:** Katy Muller

**Community of Residence:** CA

**Comment:**

I Strongly oppose proposal 75 aerial killing of grizzly bears and wolves. Killing these animals so hunters supposedly have more animals to kill is a ridiculous and shortsighted idea.

---



PC1207

**Name:** Joni Munsterteiger

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I do not support Proposal 75. Leave the wild wild. Quit trying to steal our wildlife's future.

---



PC1208

**Name:** Ted Mureiko

**Community of Residence:** Crown Point

**Comment:**

I am in opposition to proposal 75 due to the land and the wildlife in it to be protected and let nature be without human intervention if predators of this land are out of control at least let local hunters get to hunt them to help the local economy instead of just killing to kill

---



PC1209

**Name:** Holly Murfey

**Community of Residence:** Denver

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75, which would drastically reduce brown bear populations that are already at risk of habitat loss and increase ungulate populations. This would cause ecosystem devastation, leading to lack of vegetation and loss of biodiversity, as well as probable starvation to the ungulate population.

---



PC1210

**Name:** Nicola Muscat

**Community of Residence:** Malta

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1211

**Name:** Janie Talalotu, Myself

**Community of Residence:** 437 Tie Chute Lane Florence, Montana 59833

**Comment:**

#75, Why would You do this to Wildlife people come to see in your State? Understand, by your actions, you too will have cubs, pups, calves starving to death because mothers being killed! WHO DOES THIS, HUMANS EHO HAVE NO CONSCIENCE NOR HEART! Leave them alone! It's not just about us in this crazy world we live in! Wildlife have it just as tough as all of us, especially females!! Please Understand this!! You Authorities are not listening to public outcry, you need to. Shooting animals from the air and ground are UNETHICAL AND BARBARIC! Put YOURSELVES IN THE ANIMALS POSITION! THEY ARE SCARED, RUNNING FOR THERE LIVES! DO YOU FIND ENTERTAINMENT IN THIS?? WOW, YOU ARE HEARTLESS IF DO!! "IF ONLY I HAD THE POWER", IT WOULD CLEARLY BE DIFFERENT FOR THE SAKES OF WILDLIFE, ACTUALLY ALL ANIMALS IN THIS WORLD PER WHAT HUMANS DO TO THEM! THEY ARE NOT A COMMODITY AT OUR EXPENSE!! JANIE TALALOTU

---



PC1212

**Name:** Lily Noonan, N/A

**Community of Residence:** Pinewood Estates Florida

**Comment:**

Proposal 75, I am opposing this proposal, there isn't enough or any data of bears causing any excessive ailment or disease to where mankind cannot co-exist with nature. They just exist as nature intended them to and it is not up to man to decide the fate of these wild animals who live in the wild. What we can do is not build & live near these wild animals.

---



PC1213

**Name:** Amber Mancini, N/a

**Community of Residence:** Connecticut

**Comment:**

Proposal 75:

I am deeply disturbed by the notion of implementing aerial killing of bears and wolves under Proposal 75. This practice is not only unethical but also inherently cruel and inhumane. Killing wildlife from planes or helicopters resembles a wartime tactic used against dangerous criminals, not a measure befitting responsible conservation efforts. Such brutality has no place in Alaska's wildlife management policies.

Your duty as stewards of the environment is to protect wildlife and ensure the health and balance of the ecosystem—not to create terror and destruction. This proposal would not only inflict needless suffering

on animals but also disrupt predator-prey dynamics, potentially causing long-term damage to the very ecosystems you are entrusted to protect.

While I oppose the killing of animals as a solution, there are humane and scientifically-backed methods for managing wildlife populations, such as relocation, sterilization, and habitat management. These approaches uphold ethical standards while addressing conservation goals. Resorting to aerial killing dismisses these alternatives and sets a dangerous precedent of prioritizing convenience over compassion and science.

Furthermore, this proposal risks damaging Alaska's reputation as a state that values its unique and diverse wildlife. Bears and wolves are not only vital to the ecosystem but also iconic symbols of Alaska's wilderness, attracting countless visitors who value the state's natural beauty and biodiversity. Reckless actions like this threaten to tarnish that image and alienate those who cherish wildlife preservation.

I urge you to reconsider Proposal 75 and to embrace solutions that reflect respect for life, ecological integrity, and Alaska's enduring commitment to its natural heritage.

---



**Name:** Jacqueline Bock, n/a

**Community of Residence:** Sterling

**Comment:**

Proposal 75/ Unit 16

I oppose arial hunting and the indiscriminate slaughter of bears in Unit 16 under this proposal. I think there are more humane and sensible ways of population control.

Instead of increasing bear and wolf hunting quotas which could directly benefit local economies and brought additional funding to wildlife agencies, this proposal directly requests the ability to eliminate bears and wolves using random aerial shooting using state-owned aircraft, instead of gradually increasing predator hunting tags to guard against a boom and bust cycle.

This proposal is not conservation. It is draconian and not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is lazy, selfish, and irresponsible wildlife management in a place that deserves so much more care.

Unit 16, which shares its southern border with Lake Clark National Park, is one of the last pristine brown bear habitats left on earth. The brown bear population here is already under extreme threat from the devastating development of the Johnson Tract Mine, collapsing silver salmon runs, and the impending threat of continued salmon run decline. We stand to lose SO MUCH and do not want to be robbed of another natural wonder.

---



PC1215

**Name:** Faith Roame, N/A

**Community of Residence:** Pikeville, Tn

**Comment:**

Proposal #75. That's too much calling of any any rate of animal you're going to wipe them off the face of the Earth!! Please consider rehoming them as they do here in Gatlinburg Tennessee they have a great rehoming project that's proved to be very beneficial there's more room for these animals and other areas of this world without euthanizing them and so viciously.

---



PC1216

**Name:** Robin Kent, N/A

**Community of Residence:** McLean, Virginia

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75. While I am not a resident of Alaska, I have been a frequent visitor as a wildlife tourist and as a professional photographer. But should this proposal be adopted, I will not be coming back and I will advise my clients and photography colleagues to skip Alaska and take advantage of opportunities in other locations.

But my opposition is based on much more than its impact on me. Proposal 75 is seriously flawed. First, it ignores the fact that the general concept of predator eradication and its associated methods were discredited almost a century ago by careful scientific studies using precise observational data and measurements by individuals such as Adolf Murie in Denali National Park and surrounding areas. But even more seriously, Proposition 75's approach contains fundamental failings. For example, the actual root causes of the supposed problem are not fully understood. For example, according to a study reported in 2022, the moose population increased 400-fold in Togiak National Wildlife Refuge because of climate change, not the absence of wolves. Earlier studies by the Department of Fish and Game of Interior Alaska showed that Moose populations declined most sharply due to severe winter weather in the mid-1960s and early 1970s. In one report, it was acknowledged by the Department that effects of disease were not known (i.e., not studied).

Moreover, the implementation of Proposition 75 has no way of measuring success. It establishes very high percentages of wolf and bear population reduction, but the precise starting totals of those populations are unknown, based only on estimates. It fails to specify oversight and public accountability. It ignores the impacts such a program would have such as the likely destabilization of the ecosystem where this program is to be implemented. Nor is there any consideration of the impact on the Alaskan tourist and wilderness economy. Further, such a broad program requires financial and manpower resources. The means by which these are to be provided is not set forth. Will additional tax dollars be needed or will other programs be reduced in order to manage and implement this goal?

Clearly, this flawed approach must be withdrawn and further thought given to identifying the specific problem to be resolved and its actual root causes. Only then can a proper solution be developed.

---



**Name:** Marieke Van Der Maelen, N/A

**Community of Residence:** Pittsburgh, PA

**Comment:**

I am writing to express strong opposition to Proposal 75 which would authorize the hunting of bears and wolves from helicopters in order to protect moose populations in Unit 16.

I am not against wildlife management activities that support moose populations, however, this type of hunting/culling is neither ethical nor sustainable. It is also not fiscally sound. Using helicopters to kill apex predators from the air is disruptive to the natural balance of Alaska's ecosystems. This type of wildlife management also sets a dangerous precedent for wildlife management.

From a fiscal standpoint, Proposal 75 is a waste of valuable taxpayer resources. ADFG itself recognizes that the "adoption of this proposal would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities." ADFG's own reporting of similar intensive management efforts to protect the Mulchatna caribou herd in 2024 states that "overlapping confidence intervals across these years suggest that the population could have been anywhere on the spectrum of values, and in fact, could have been declining instead of growing. The harvest objective of 2,400 – 8,000 has not been met due to the close of seasons for continued conservation concerns as the MCH has shown no appreciable population increase since at least 2017."

Basic principles of good stewardship of public funds require and must show evidence of a return on investment. If ADFG cannot show proof of evidence and cannot credibly say that the intensive management activities have evidenced a modicum of success in other units, than Proposal 75 is essentially placing hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on chance in the hope for a satisfactory outcome. This is not enough to justify these actions, and taxpayers deserve better.

Furthermore, hunting from helicopters introduces a significant ethical concern. It is a method of hunting that is neither fair or humane, and it does not honor the spirit of the sport. An aerial approach eliminates the possibility for animals to flee or defend themselves, essentially rendering it a one-sided slaughter. This approach is at odds with the principles of ethical hunting which emphasizes fair chase and respect for the natural behaviors of wildlife. I believe that it is imperative that wildlife management efforts reflect our collective responsibility to treat all wildlife with dignity and compassion and to mitigate unfair and distressing scenarios for these animals.

While I recognize that under Proposal 75 ADFG is proposing initially to conduct intensive management activities on wolves, the statement by ADFG that "[t]he department has no plans to activate bear control at this time" rings hollow. Proposal 75 would allow the department to switch to intensive management of bear populations without any notice and without any scientific data to support these activities.

Moreover, the impact of this practice long term and in the broader ecosystem could be irreparable. Bears and wolves play integral roles in maintaining the health and stability of Alaska's ecosystems. As apex predators, these species help regulate populations of other species and help prevent overgrazing that negatively affects vegetation. The removal of these two predators from the landscape could very possibly lead to negative and unintended ecological consequences which could, in turn, come back to harm the very moose populations it intended to protect. We need to consider these long-term effects on wildlife and their natural habitats that could result from such drastic and unnatural action.

The proposal also fails to consider non-lethal alternatives for managing predator populations. Scientific research has demonstrated again and again that there are more ethical, humane, and effective ways to support moose populations. This research includes using habitat restoration, addressing human-related disturbances and conflicts, and implementing targeted, localized management practices. Focusing on poaching is also not discussed in Proposal 75 and needs to be addressed. By ADFG's own reporting on intensive management activities in 2024 regarding authorized hunting of the Maltchatna caribou herd, "We suspect that actual harvest is substantially higher than the reported harvest." The reality is that AFG has no firm data to indicate that either bears or wolves are the primary contributors to perceived declines in moose populations in Unit 16. By prioritizing non-lethal methods to help moose populations, we promote a more equitable, sustainable, and balanced approach to wildlife conservation. We also prioritize conservation methods that respect the integrity of the entire ecosystem while also considering the welfare and dignity of all specials involved.

Finally, I urge the Alaska Board of Game to reject Proposal 75 and consider more ethical and fiscally and ecologically sound measures for protecting moose and other large game populations. The use of helicopters to cull bears and wolves is not only inhumane but also threatens Alaska's natural environment. We have a duty to protect and respect all species, including apex predators and to consider responsible methods for wildlife management activities in both the present and the future.

I ask that you reconsider this unfair and unsustainable proposal and focus on more sustainable and humane wildlife management practices that will benefit the moose and all species in Alaska's broader ecosystem.



PC1218

**Name:** Penny Goodstein, NA

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, AK

**Comment:**

OPPOSE

PROPOSAL 75

5 AAC 92.122. Intensive Management Plan VI.

Add Department removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears to Unit 16 Intensive Management Plan



PC1219

**Name:** Allison Joyce, NA

**Community of Residence:** Nassau

**Comment:**

75, stop the gunning of brown bears!

---



PC1220

**Name:** Paul Napier

**Community of Residence:** Amherst, NY

**Comment:**

Regarding Proposal 75, the random aerial shooting of bears and wolves is a lazy and irresponsible attempt at wildlife management. Adjustments to hunting guidelines could be tried before resorting to random killing from aircraft. The goals described in terms of numbers remaining and percentages killed are abhorrent. This is not just some out-of-left-field opinion from someone in the lower 48. This is formed through communication with wildlife experts familiar with bear and wolf populations in Alaska whose only objectives are continuation and promotion of wildlife and wildlife habitats.

---



PC1221

**Name:** Court Whelan, Natural Habitat Adventures

**Community of Residence:** US Citizen

**Comment:**

As you may know, wildlife watching is a \$2billion per year industry in Alaska, and this industry relies on big, charismatic megafauna like bears, wolves, moose, and whales. The idea of culling bears and wolves at this scale and number (proposal 75) is an astounding affront to the people of Alaska and the citizens of the US that not only cherish one of the last remaining wildernesses of the US and world, but understand the value of these animals from an economic standpoint.

In order to make such a decision, you must start with researching peer-reviewed papers like "The Economic Contributions of Bear Viewing in Southcentral Alaska," conducted by Taylor B. Young and Joseph M. Little from the University of Alaska Fairbanks. This, among many others, provides an in-depth analysis of the economic impact of bear viewing tourism in the region and focuses on areas such as Katmai National Park & Preserve, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, Lake Clark National Park & Preserve, and the broader Cook Inlet region.

It's been demonstrated time and time again that through the value chain of tourism, wildlife is worth anywhere from 5 to 5,000 times more money to local economies when left alive and in tact vs. dead or degraded. It's known that bear viewing/photography in this small area of Alaska brings in over \$45 million annually. Increasing the cull of animals (proposal 75) that attract literally 10s of millions of dollars of tourism dollars annually is undeniably removing money from the local economy and at the harm of the Alaskan economy.

---



PC1222

**Name:** Dana Cama, Natural Habitat Adventures

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposition 75 perpetuates a history of failed predator control programs in Alaska. Past attempts to reduce bear and wolf populations have shown little to no long-term benefits for prey species like moose and caribou. These aggressive methods disrupt ecosystems, harming both predator and prey populations. Bears, for example, play a crucial role in maintaining ecosystem health. Moreover, predator control programs are costly and ineffective, wasting millions of dollars that could be better spent on habitat restoration and scientific research. Proposition 75 is a shortsighted policy that ignores scientific evidence and past lessons—Alaska deserves better wildlife management.

---



PC1223

**Name:** Leanne Keck, Natural Habitat Adventures

**Community of Residence:** St Lawrence, South Dakota

**Comment:**

Re: Prop 75

I am writing a comment to express opposition to Prop 75. Because of the ecological benefits provided by the brown bear to the environment, I strongly oppose prop 75 so as to preserve the symbiotic nature of these elements in Alaska's bear coast region.

---



PC1224

**Name:** Julia Navarro

**Community of Residence:** British Columbia

**Comment:**

Proposal #75

I am appalled that there is plans to shoot brown bears from helicopters or planes to reduce populations. This is a very inhumane wildlife management plan. Of the bears do not die immediately, they suffer horrific slow deaths after being chased to exhaustion.

Please do not pass this bill.

---



PC1225

**Name:** Lisa Neal

**Community of Residence:** Pa

**Comment:**

I oppose increase in Bear and Wolves hunting To decrease population #75

---



PC1226

**Name:** Elijah Nelson

**Community of Residence:** Seward

**Comment:**

I am commenting on proposal 75. I am very clear opposition on proposal 75. I work in tourism and rely on the perceived beauty and pristine nature of Alaska to make my living. The company I work for will take tourists to bear guides that operate in Lake Clark National Park. The culling of wild bears and other large predators in the surrounding area, I believe would negatively affect the thriving tourism of the area. People travel from all over the world to view coastal brown bears in this area. What will I tell guests that have traveled all this way to view wild brown bears? That just past the parks borders the Alaska government does not care about bears in the same way guests do?

I also oppose the use of aerial shooting of bears and wolves instead of letting hunters legally take these animals. If management must be done, I believe that local guides and local hunter's should take the animals and not government contracted sharpshooters. The economic benefit of hunting these animals would be much more beneficial than spending tax payer money to shoot bears that will not be utilized in any way.

In short I oppose proposal 75 because of Tourism concerns for bear viewing and guided hunting.

---



PC1227

**Name:** Rose Netherland

**Community of Residence:** Fayetteville AR

**Comment:**

75: OPPOSE It is critical that we protect bears and wildlife, as they are already threatened due to human population and development. Bears should not be murdered, they should be protected in their habitat.

---



PC1228

**Name:** Stephanie Nevadunsky

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in the state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy

populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1229

**Name:** Stacey Newton

**Community of Residence:** Iowa

**Comment:**

I am here to oppose Proposal 75 to protect the bears and wolves in Alaska. They are a very important part of our ecosystem!

---



PC1230

**Name:** Diane Nichols

**Community of Residence:** Midwest United States

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I, Diane Nichols,

strongly oppose the senseless killing of bears and wolves via aerial shooting of massive numbers of this wildlife. It is unbelievable and incredibly disappointing to me that a state as beautiful, magnificent, natural and wild as Alaska would potentially consider to allow such an extreme measure to be taken. What happened to "the circle of life"?

---



PC1231

**Name:** Jane Nicholson

**Community of Residence:** Manitowish Waters, WI

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 (in opposition)

The reduction of the wolf population to 25% of its current numbers in order to raise moose populations by one third, sounds like slaughter more than conservation or even "wildlife management." Conducting this "hunt" by air sounds ridiculously expensive—create a protected migration path instead. The air approach would pollute; it would be intrusive to wildlife and human populations. It is not clear that such a costly plan would work; it likely would lack accuracy. This plan also calls for shooting hundreds of bears. Wolves and bears are keystone species in their ranges who support biodiversity; their habits cull other species and allow others to thrive, flora and fauna.

Taking these elevated numbers of animals could also fail in its basic goal. This plan seems intrusive and harmful to all species involved, including humans who are also increasing in number.

---



PC1232

**Name:** Helen Nickerson

**Community of Residence:** Bellingham , WA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is a horrible idea! The widespread elimination of Apex predators will not assist the state of Alaska in efficient game management.

---



PC1233

**Name:** Bridget Nicosia

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - these animals deserve to live!

---



PC1234

**Name:** Sophia Nied

**Community of Residence:** Ireland

**Comment:**

I oppose to proposal 75 - the gunning and killing of wild bear and wolves in the Alaskan area.

Our world is slowly becoming overpopulated with humans and we cannot continue to live on this planet without animals, wildlife, nature.

Wildlife is not the enemy. We cannot create more land. Once it is gone it is gone. Some of the areas on this planet are simply not for human use and should be left untouched. We cannot create live together with animals around their habits but they cannot live inside our busy cities and urbanised areas. So please do not kill these innocent animals. Have some empathy, please.

Kindest regards,

Sophia

---



PC1235

**Name:** Seth Nielsen

**Community of Residence:** Palmer, Alaska

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75: including any aerial gunning of predators in that Management unit (16) As this type of management is not proven to increase Moose and Caribou herds significantly and is a waste of natural and fiscal resources.

This is unnecessary and seems to me like mismanagement on several levels.

---



PC1236

**Name:** Sayali Nilangekar

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: Oppose the gunning of bears and wolves!! Let the wildlife be!

---



PC1237

**Name:** Cassie Noel

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Proposal 75- strongly oppose

To the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75, which seeks to authorize an aerial predator control program targeting 100 wolves annually in Game Management Unit 16. This proposal raises significant ecological, scientific, and ethical concerns, as outlined below:

1. **Ineffectiveness of Predator Control Programs:** Decades of research, including a 2022 article by biologists from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) and the University of Alaska Fairbanks, have demonstrated that predator control programs do not lead to increased moose harvests. Despite nearly 40 years of predator control efforts in Southcentral Alaska, no measurable increase in moose harvests has been achieved. Implementing a program with no proven success undermines the principles of science-based wildlife management.

2. **Lack of Scientific Rigor and Monitoring:** Proposal 75 relies on outdated management practices and lacks robust scientific monitoring to evaluate its impacts on predator populations or prey dynamics. Effective wildlife management should be grounded in rigorous research that accurately assesses population trends and the ecological consequences of intervention. This proposal fails to meet those standards.

3. **Damage to Alaska's Reputation:** The proposed program borders some of the world's most iconic wildlife viewing areas, such as Denali and Lake Clark National Parks. Predator control is highly unpopular with the general public and risks tarnishing Alaska's image as a leader in responsible wildlife management. Previous aerial predator control programs, including the gunning of nearly 200 bears, have already drawn criticism. Approving such programs further erodes public trust in the Board of Game's ability to make sustainable and ethical decisions.

4. **Financial Costs and Inefficiency:** ADFG acknowledges that this program would impose significant costs, with recent predator control efforts costing hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. In a time of financial strain for both the state and ADFG, dedicating such resources to ineffective programs is fiscally irresponsible. Additionally, predator control programs have already led to the loss of approximately \$2.5 million in federal funding, further straining budgets for non-game programs.

5. **Lack of Public Oversight Post-Approval:** If Proposal 75 is approved, ADFG will have unchecked authority to implement an operational aerial gunning plan without further public input. This lack of transparency underscores the importance of rejecting this proposal during the current comment period.

As a wildlife advocate and someone who deeply values Alaska's unique ecosystems, I believe that predator control programs like this undermine ecological balance and fail to address the root causes of moose population challenges. Rather than investing in costly and ineffective predator control, I urge the Board of Game to explore non-lethal and science-based management strategies that prioritize long-term ecological health and public trust.

Thank you for considering my comments. I hope the Board will reject Proposal 75 and adopt a more responsible approach to wildlife management in Alaska.

Sincerely,

Cassie Noel

---

**Name:** Cory Noel

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

To the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to adamantly oppose Proposal 75, which seeks to authorize an aerial predator control program targeting 100 wolves annually in Game Management Unit 16. Let me be clear: moving forward with this proposal is not only a reckless assault on Alaska's wildlife but also a glaring failure of your responsibility to protect and preserve our natural ecosystems. If approved, this decision will have far-reaching consequences, both for the ecological health of Alaska and for the credibility of this Board.

The data is undeniable: predator control doesn't work. A 2022 study conducted by your own colleagues at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) and the University of Alaska Fairbanks proves this beyond doubt. Decades of predator control efforts in Southcentral Alaska have failed to deliver increased moose harvests. Despite killing countless predators, there has been no measurable improvement for



PC1238

hunters or prey populations. If this proposal moves forward, the Board will be knowingly investing in a failed, antiquated approach—and the public will hold you accountable.

This program is a biological gamble with no safety net. Proposal 75 is built on outdated, unscientific assumptions and lacks the robust monitoring necessary to measure its impacts. The ecological consequences of removing 100 wolves annually from this region are unpredictable and dangerous. Wolves are apex predators, vital to maintaining healthy ecosystems. By targeting them, you risk triggering a cascade of negative effects—unchecked prey populations, habitat degradation, and potential disease outbreaks. Approving this proposal without rigorous, science-based safeguards will show negligence, plain and simple.

Your reputation as stewards of Alaska’s wildlife is already on the line. Alaska is known globally for its stunning natural beauty and unique wildlife. Yet programs like this—poorly studied and widely unpopular—are undermining that reputation. Public trust in the Board of Game is eroding fast, and this proposal will only accelerate that decline. Aerial predator control near world-class destinations like Denali and Lake Clark National Parks is a public relations disaster waiting to happen. You are risking national and international backlash, with far-reaching consequences for Alaska’s image as a responsible wildlife manager.

The financial waste is staggering. Let’s be honest: this program is a money pit. Predator control programs have already cost Alaska millions of dollars, while cutting off access to federal funding that could benefit other essential wildlife initiatives. Spending another quarter-million dollars annually on a program that has been scientifically discredited is not only fiscally irresponsible but also deeply disrespectful to taxpayers. Approving Proposal 75 would make this Board complicit in financial mismanagement.

Let me leave you with this: your decision here will define your legacy. Are you leaders who act on science, transparency, and sound management? Or will you be remembered as those who ignored the evidence, mismanaged public funds, and let Alaska’s wildlife pay the ultimate price?

The public is watching. The scientific community is watching. The world is watching. Do not make a mistake you cannot take back. Reject Proposal 75 and commit to responsible, science-based wildlife management practices that reflect Alaska’s values and protect its future.

Sincerely,

Cory Noel

---

**Name:** Mac Nolde

**Community of Residence:** Montana

**Comment:**

I oppose The proposal 75. Alaska is the last great habitat of bears. A wonderful representation of our country. They bring in a lot of tourism which is good for Alaska. Aerially gunning down the bears is absurd and cowardly. We moved into their habitat. They deserve to live in theirs.

---





PC1240

**Name:** Gemma Nowrie

**Community of Residence:** Anstruther

**Comment:**

I am commenting to oppose the killing of bears via arial shoots. This is unnecessary and will create further stress to these animals.

They are sentient beings who deserve to be here and share this planet with us. Humans do not get to decide which animals live or die.

Correction from proposal 79 to 275\*

---



PC1241

**Name:** Alyssa Nunez

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

It is wrong to hunt from a helicopter animals who have no way of fighting back. It is disgraceful and honestly disgusting. You already took their land what else do you want. Proposal 75 is horrific. I oppose.

---



PC1242

**Name:** Amanda O'Keefe

**Community of Residence:** NYC

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. It is our duty to protect and preserve wildlife. Humans already encroach on their habitats and we should not be using completely unfair and inhumane methods to harm and kill them, especially with a goal of killing such a large percent of the population.

---



PC1243

**Name:** Jennie O'Shaughnessy DeLeon

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I am deeply concerned about Provision 75 related to brown bears and the destructive nature of encouraging Ariel hunting. I am most concerned with the impact on their population, And also with the impact on species interdependent to their population.

---



PC1244

**Name:** Kristin Obert

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose #75. Please leave the bears and wolves alone. Let nature be.

---



PC1245

**Name:** Lauren O'Brien

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 to control predator populations is a lazy and irresponsible plan to inhumanely destroy the populations of native predators to increase human ungulate harvest. Research shows that eliminating natural predators has no significant impact on human harvests. Also, we've seen the impacts of eliminating predators on prey populations. In a few years, a proposition will be in place to hunt larger amounts of ungulates in order to reduce overpopulation. Instead of inhumanely punishing the local ecosystem, we as humans should be trying to maintain a balance beneficial to the WILDLIFE, not whatever is convenient for us. We don't need to kill animals who have called Alaska their home for hundreds of years. Instead, find the root of the ungulate's low population and start there. Has a plan like Proposal 75 ever worked out long term? No, so why are we repeating these same mistakes? Doing this on the border of a national park is particularly vile. If you must do anything, relocate and research. Aerial execution of these animals is the easiest, cheapest, short term fix - anyone can see that. Ungulates are not going to go extinct in this area because of predators they've coevolved with for millions of years. Wolves, bears, and other predators are already largely threatened species. It is the job of any wildlife agency to Protect native species. How is shooting them protecting them? Figure something else out.

---



PC1246

**Name:** Claire Oconnor

**Community of Residence:** McMinnville OR

**Comment:**

I am planning to visit Alaska on vacation next summer and was saddened to hear that proposal 75 was advocating shooting wolves and bear.

---



PC1247

**Name:** Kaitlin OConnor

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

I am disgusted and ashamed that proposal 75 is even being considered. Gunning down wolves and bears is an absolute travesty and would be a permanent stain on our state and our country. I vehemently oppose.

---



PC1248

**Name:** Tessa O'Connor

**Community of Residence:** England

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75.

The reason for the reduction objectives has not been given. I'd like to see an in-depth critical analysis studying the effect of removing this number of each target species to identify possible ecological imbalance caused by it.

If the purpose of doing this is to reduce competition for hunters then I fully disagree with the proposal as conservation of biodiversity should always be upheld over hunting for sport, which is an unnecessary activity.

If it is to reduce predators for humans living in the area-the land is not solely for them, they've chosen to live in a place where wild animals also inhabit and should live with the consequences, not have the native populations killed for their convenience. As this is an unsustainable management strategy.

Furthermore the ethics of using helicopters is questionable due to the fear that chasing wild animals with them causes which should not have to be endured by any living creature.

Top-down trophic cascade could also be caused by the proposal. The effect of the loss of wolves from Yellowstone and the positive impacts of reintroducing them is a good example of why critical pathway analysis is needed for proposals like this.

---



PC1249

**Name:** Justin Oertel

**Community of Residence:** Brandon, Manitoba

**Comment:**

Save the Wildlife!! SAY NO TO #75!!!

---



PC1250

**Name:** Izabela Ogrodnik

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Opposing proposal 75- inhumane areal shooting of black bears, brown bears and wolves for population control.

---



PC1251

**Name:** Angela O'Hare

**Community of Residence:** Wilmington

**Comment:**

Please don't move forward with proposal 75. Wolves and brown and black bears deserve to live on this planet in peace. Humans aren't the only animals that matter!

---



PC1252

**Name:** April Oldenburg

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

Proposal number 75 - oppose

---



PC1253

**Name:** Allison Oliver

**Community of Residence:** Cooper Bay

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Expand tags on predators in this unit to increase state revenue to wildlife resources and provide hunting and economic opportunities instead of wasteful killing. This is irresponsible game management and poor economics. Also consider cumulative effects of undulate decline and ways to reduce those impacts like habitat protection or carbon output reduction strategies by the state of AK.

---



PC1254

**Name:** Kristin Olson

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 and the horrific and unnecessary slaughter of animals being suggested.

---



PC1255

**Name:** John O'Neil

**Community of Residence:** Miami

**Comment:**

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to proposal 75 in unit 16, which aims to reduce the population of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal undermines the value of wildlife conservation and threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in the beautiful state.

---



PC1256

**Name:** Elizabeth O'Neill

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

I am writing about prop 75, which threatens to slaughter the incredible mega fauna that make Alaska so special and unique. These animals are integral to some of the last intact ecosystems left on earth. Please do not gun them down, rather, consult biologists, ecologists, and other experts to determine the necessity of/ how to enact humane and reasonable population control.

---



PC1257

**Name:** Diana Oppenheim

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75.

We need to respect and support predators like wolves and bears. They are important for ecological functions and will become increasingly important to protect as climate change continues to change the landscapes.

Using cruel tactics such as shooting predators from a helicopter will have no positive impact on anyone, including hunters, or any business.

---

**Name:** Diana Oroza

**Community of Residence:** Mexico

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposal 75, wolves and bears are important to the ecosystem, we should not kill them, here are some facts:

- Make the Forest Fertile

It is understood bears love to eat fish. By dragging salmon carcasses through the forest, they help to enrich the soil. This is good for trees and other forest cover vegetation. Additionally, they deposit scat on the forest floors. Animal waste deposits are great for enriching the soil. They act as a natural growth booster.

- Seed Dispersion

Bears help in seed dispersion. When they eat fruits, seeds do not undergo digestion and pass out as fecal matters. Bears deposit these seeds on different parts of the ecosystem resulting in new plant growth. Black bears, in particular, eat a lot of fruit and vegetation so they are amongst the main seed dispersion agents.

- Clean the Forest and Maintain Ecosystem Balance

The forest would be littered with carcasses if not for bears. Even though bears are not scavengers, they help by eating these carcasses. Additionally, bears are predators by nature so they help to maintain the balance of the ecosystem by reducing the population of animals like the deer, moose, and bucks just to mention a few.

So as wolves:

By changing the dynamics of other wildlife species, wolves can also affect the vegetation and other characteristics of natural landscapes. While there are few examples in Washington, land once overgrazed by deer, elk, and other herbivores recovered once wolves returned to the area.

After wolves were removed from Yellowstone Park in the early part of the last century, the problem of overgrazing became so acute that herds of elk, pronghorn, and bison were culled to protect the remaining vegetation. Since 1995, when wolves were reintroduced to the park, there has been resurgence of woody browse species in some areas such as willow and aspen.

Some scientists have suggested that a similar situation may exist in Olympic National Park, where extensive browsing by elk may have caused substantial changes in riparian plant communities. This, in turn, has been linked to riverbank erosion and channel widening, which reduce rearing habitat for salmon, steelhead, and resident fish.

---



PC1259

**Name:** Lissette Ortega

**Community of Residence:** Dallas TX

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75

please do not kill these beautiful majestic animals!

---



PC1260

**Name:** Denise Osmon

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

This isn't conservation and is not ethical.

Grizzlies already face encroachment the mines and from humans. All

Animals are self regulating and are completely unnecessary to kill. With 73% of the world's wildlife populations gone in the last 50 years and 39% of United States wildlife populations gone we need to be able to coexist. Do better! Grizzlies are running out of space!

I'm opposed to prop 75!

---



PC1261

**Name:** Gianna Ossello

**Community of Residence:** Underwood, Washington

**Comment:**

Comment for Proposal 75:

Predator control as a means to protecting the populations of their prey - especially unethical methods like aerial gundown - is archaic and outdated. Not to mention the history of predator control is tightly interwoven with Americas racist history.

Alaska, along with other arctic regions, is feeling the impacts of climate change acutely. Biodiversity loss is one of the most pressing issues facing our time and there is little evidence to suggest predator control is effective at maintaining biodiversity in the long run. Instead of putting precious money and resources into a "quick and dirty band-aid fix" that predator control is, the money and resources would be much better off being spent on more sustainable solutions like habitat restoration, emissions reduction, invasive species control, and other science-backed solutions.

---



PC1262

**Name:** Kelsey Otteni

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

Commenting on proposal number 75.

This will disrupt the balance of ecosystems, potentially leading to species extinction, impacting biodiversity, and causing ripple effects throughout the food chain, ultimately affecting the health of entire environments. Man kind is greedy and has caused so much harm by trying to eliminate what is in their way. Respectfully man kind is in the way and needs to have some respect for nature. Do not allow this!

---



PC1263

**Name:** J P

**Community of Residence:** SLC

**Comment:**

NO TO PROPOSITION 75!

This is a cruel and senseless act of violence against innocent creatures. Also, something that can only be extended to wealthy, trophy hunters that have nothing to do with sport hunting! Alaska has an invaluable resource that is not available elsewhere in the world. It should not be squandered. Consider what was done to bison, wolves, bear, and many other species in North America and elsewhere in the world. We know better than this and Alaska, we can do better than this. To gun down hundreds of bears and wolves from helicopters is not only inhumane but also environmentally destructive. These animals are vital to the delicate balance of the ecosystem. We cannot stand idly by while such a tragedy unfolds. Please, reconsider this proposal and choose compassion over cruelty and greed!

---



PC1264

**Name:** Kristin Pace

**Community of Residence:** Palmer

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE proposal 75. There is no scientific evidence that backs an assumption of predator control reviving ungulate populations. In fact, it often allows disease to spread among ungulate populations, making them more unhealthy. Additionally, as a former aviation contractor, I am intimately familiar with the hourly cost of helicopter and airplane operations. The state cannot afford this, as we are already operating at a deficit. Please direct our limited funds to more worthwhile efforts such as increasing ADF&G staff's salaries, health benefits, land conservation efforts, etc. This unproven method is expensive and a waste of resources and wildlife.

---



PC1265

**Name:** Taylor Packard

**Community of Residence:** Atlanta, GA USA

**Comment:**

Extremely opposed to the use of aerial drones/shooters, the waste of meat, and the lack of opportunity for hunters as well as the financial benefit of the community were actual hunters to replace these aerial strikes. Oppose proposal 75!

---



PC1266

**Name:** Emily Palko

**Community of Residence:** Chittenden

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75! This is government overreach and the parties involved should be ashamed of themselves.

---



PC1267

**Name:** Kate Palladino

**Community of Residence:** Austin

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is unethical and inhumane. It would be devastating to wildlife and future generations of wildlife enthusiasts.

---



PC1268

**Name:** Paige Palmer

**Community of Residence:** WY

**Comment:**

OPPOSE #75

---



PC1269

**Name:** Jane Panju

**Community of Residence:** State of Hawaii Maui County

**Comment:**

Thank you for the opportunity to indicate that I oppose Proposal 75.

---



PC1270

**Name:** Chloe Pappa Eddy

**Community of Residence:** Indiana

**Comment:**

Oppose prop. 75 because it is cruel and unnecessary. Leave the bears and wolves alone. They're in their habitat and are important to our planet's ecosystem. Stop trying to kill animals and for dumb reasons.

---



PC1271

**Name:** Anita Paraley

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I do not live anywhere near this area but cannot understand why this is necessary. I do not hear of serious issues with bears and wolves. While I admit to being less knowledgeable than many, in my purview these animals keep a healthy balance to the environment. Please consider an alternate plan or at least lessen the number of animals you propose to kill.

---



PC1272

**Name:** Christina Parker

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

If proposal 75 passes, according to the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, the goal of the measure is to reduce the wolf population in this area by 73–80%. That is sickening that this is even on the table! Please do not pass this proposal.

---



PC1273

**Name:** Christina Parker

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Do not pass proposal 75. According to the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, the goal of the measure is to reduce the wolf population in this area by 73–80%.

This is absurd that you would allow this.

---



PC1274

**Name:** Karrin Parker

**Community of Residence:** Palmer

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE Proposal 75 for the following reasons:

Alaska’s predator control programs — aimed at boosting moose, caribou, and deer populations for hunters — do not work to increase human moose harvest. A 2022 article by ADFG and University of Alaska Fairbanks biologists published in the scientific journal *Diversity*, found no increase in moose harvests in the years following nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska. Listen to an interview with the author here.

Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts and occurs without effective monitoring programs designed to scientifically evaluate impacts on predator populations, or identify causal relationships between predator control and prey population dynamics. Large carnivore management in Alaska should be based on rigorous science including the status and trends of carnivore populations - this program does not meet those standards. Read more in the 2019 article, *Large carnivores under assault in Alaska*, which was authored by three Alaska state and federal wildlife biologists.

The proposed aerial gunning program borders some of the most iconic wildlife viewing areas in the world. Predator control is not popular with the general public. The State’s reputation as a responsible wildlife manager is rightfully beginning to sour after aerially gunning down nearly 200 bears in southwestern Alaska. Authorizing this program on such loose and un-studied biological grounds bruises Alaska’s image and erodes public faith in the Board of Game to make sustainable decisions.

By ADFG’s own admission: “Adoption of this proposal would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities” (ADFG comments on Prop 75, Page 224). The Intensive Management program against bears and wolves a few hundred miles west cost \$231,000 in 2022 and \$612,000 in 2023 (page 14, 2024 annual report to Board of Game) Predator control as a whole has accounted for ~\$2.5 million in lost federal funding, as Pitman Roberts funds cannot be used for Intensive management. At a time when ADFG has almost no funding for non-game programs and the State is struggling for cash, it is unwise to dedicate another quarter million dollars each year to predator control programs that have yet to be deemed effective.

If approved, this proposal would give ADFG full reign to implement an aerial gunning plan in Unit 16. Once a proposal like this is approved, ADFG has the authority to develop an Operational Plan for aerial gunning that is not open to public comment.

---



PC1275

**Name:** Matthew Parker

**Community of Residence:** Wilmington

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75

---



PC1276

**Name:** Ev Parks

**Community of Residence:** U.S.A.

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75. Bears and wolves are critically important to the ecosystem. They should not be slaughtered in mass. Any population control should be thoroughly researched prior to any action. If needed, only the most HUMANE and ETHICAL options should be considered and as minimally as possible.

---



PC1277

**Name:** Kerry Parks

**Community of Residence:** Central southwest region

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposition 75. It is a grave mistake to kill anymore wildlife. Humans have caused enough species to go extinct. Mother nature should be in control of the wildlife population, not humans. There are more than enough resources for humans to have their needs met without reducing the population of wildlife.

---



PC1278

**Name:** Carmel Parr

**Community of Residence:** Phoenix

**Comment:**

75. Do not allow such cruel and heinous actions!

---



PC1279

**Name:** Aj Parsley

**Community of Residence:** Woodbury

**Comment:**

I am opposing on proposal 75. Ever since I was a little kid, I have loved bears. My grandpa goes to Alaska every year and states it is beautiful there. Bears never bothered him, in fact there was one time he fed one. Bears are apart of nature just like us.

---



PC1280

**Name:** Robert Paslaqua

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning.

This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1281

**Name:** Alyssa Pasquale

**Community of Residence:** None

**Comment:**

75. Oppose. This proposal is cruel! Animals do not deserve to be killed for being in their territory. They were here first. Please do the humane thing and let them live in peace. Random targeting is now how you solve and over population issue.

---



PC1282

**Name:** Eshika Patel

**Community of Residence:** PA

**Comment:**

Oppose Proposal 75

---



PC1283

**Name:** Kimberly Patterson

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

Oppose the killing of wolves and bears. Oppose Prop 75

---



PC1284

**Name:** Abhishek Patwardhan

**Community of Residence:** Maryland

**Comment:**

I firmly oppose proposal 75. Studies from ADFG's own scientists have shown that predator control is not effective at increasing human harvest. What the state wants to do here is basically turn pristine wilderness between Denali and Lake Clarke into permanent killing fields, because to keep predator populations low you will have to keep killing them every year to have any effect. Hundreds of thousands of visitors come to Alaska (and its national parks) to experience the wildness which has been lost elsewhere. If they actually knew the extent of interference and mismanagement by the state, I think those numbers would drop very close to 0. I have been travelling to Alaska and Fairbanks almost every month since fall 2021. I have been to Denali at least 5-7 times in that timeframe. I have yet to see wolves in Denali.

---



PC1285

**Name:** Esteban Pau

**Community of Residence:** Vancouver

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is probably the worst thing I heard in a long time. I can't believe this is actually being considered! I strongly oppose

---



PC1286

**Name:** Wolf Paws

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

The proposal number 75 the plan you have to go Murder,Poach,and kill Grizzly bears and Gray Wolf's is so 1909 methods for clearing some space in a forrest section, There's no need to use Scroched Earth hunting tactics on are very important WildLife, you humans at Alaska game and fish,want to clear some forrest space out use tranquilizers and relocate Bears and Wolfs, if your doing this to try and raise elk,deer,moose, populations well once again Murdering,Poaching,Killing any Grizzly bears or freaking Gray Wolfs does not line up with Science based management of these species, both Wolfs and Bears feed on sick and disease animals of those moose,Elk, Deer populations the only reason to hunt any Wolf or Bear is only for Trophy Hunting purposes and I strongly disagree with that and any mass killing,Murdering,Poaching of Gray Wolf's And Grizzly Bears This 1900s style crap still be using today in 2024 is down right ridiculous, these means and methods on management of are predators must Stop !!!! Start Murdering Gray Wolf's and Grizzly Bears I'll make sure the whole world knows social media style,How about you just keep your Paws Off of Are Gray Wolf's and Grizzly Bears, Murdering WildLife for no good reason, does not sit well in my heart or soul and never will ! LASTLY if your Hunters are not starving from lack of food on a daily bases then there is no good reason to Murder,Poach,and kill Gray Wolf's or Grizzly Bears that simple that my Reasoning for my comments

---



PC1287

**Name:** Claire Payne

**Community of Residence:** Georgia, VT, USA

**Comment:**

In my opinion it is cruel, outdated and unnecessary proceed with aerial gunning in all of Unit 16, which borders the southern half of Denali NP/Preserve and the Northeast border of Lake Clark NP/Preserve to kill wolves and bears and lower their population by well over 50%.

I oppose proposal 75.

Thank you,

Claire Payne

---



PC1288

**Name:** Glenn Peckel

**Community of Residence:** Little egg harbor New Jersey

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

I am opposed because I do not believe that this is based on science

---



PC1289

**Name:** Kelsey Pedersen

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

OPPOSE proposal 75

---



PC1290

**Name:** Jennifer Peery

**Community of Residence:** Pacific Grove

**Comment:**

I am commenting here to voice my strong opposition to proposal number 75. This proposal is absolutely outrageous!!! If one would take the time to learn about and witness these bears in their natural environment it is unconscionable to imagine that they would then support such a massive slaughter of these majestic creatures. There is already so much slaughter in this world, why add more to the heap by destroying something that is so beautiful and uniquely special? Please don't let this pass. Take the time to see for yourself exactly what would be destroyed here. The passing of this proposal would be an absolute crime, and that is an understatement.

---



PC1291

**Name:** Sandra Pella

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. I have thoroughly read all material available on Proposal 75 including background articles and information and thus strongly oppose Intensive Management Plan VI, to add the Department removal of wolves, brown bears and black bears to Unit 16 Intensive Management Plan.

I strongly oppose the proposed "notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land-and-shoot permits as a method of wolf removal and

may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783" in order to kill and reduce the wolf population in Unit 16B to a mere 35-55 wolves; although the proposal does not expressly outline a "reduction goal for bears" I oppose the exiting predator control plans for Unit 16 which reduces black bears by 60-80% and brown bears by 60%.

ADFG states in Proposal 75 that "the department has no plans to activate bear control at this time" yet the State has a track record of authorizing bear control programs without a proposal and of authoring bear control in this unit. This proposal could indeed lead the way to the Department enacting aerial gun control of wolves and bears without having such authority, as soon as three years from this proposal.

In fact, when the public around the world learned of Alaska's wildlife predator control methods the shock and disgust made it incredibly clear that killing predators is not acceptable wildlife management. The area specified includes some of the most popular and iconic wildlife viewing in the world. People follow these animals live on camera! The value of life - wildlife - alive far outweighs any agenda to kill to reach a "goal" to "reduce" lives, invaluable lives of wolves and bears. The aerial gunning down of nearly 200 bears in southwestern Alaska has nearly sealed the reputation of the State as irresponsible. That a State known for its incredible beauty and magnificent wildlife could further request an agenda that would erode public faith and trust in protecting nature, and sustaining predator populations.

Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts (that have never worked). Alaskan wildlife biologists have stated and written about the lack of scientific evidence to support these killing programs. A standard of truth and conscientiousness is non-existent here.

Alaska's predator control programs aimed at boosting moose, caribou and deer populations for hunters at the demise of wolves and bears - do not work to increase human moose harvest, These killing programs have historically since 1999 I believe, have done nothing other than kill. This culture of killing must end. This magnificent landscape is meant to be home to self-sustaining populations of wolves and bears. Moose caribou and deer populations rely on these predators - the habitat they coexist in requires that all be present to be a healthy ecosystem. No human intervention of "control" will ever succeed.

The popularity of the wildlife viewing across the world in this unit should stand alone and lead the State to a path of living with all wildlife, accepting their beneficial and irreplaceable role in this great landscape. The cost of killing in the hundreds of thousands of dollars into the millions would be far better spent - no contest really - on preserving and protecting predators and education to the public on the aspects of what they see when they visit such a spectacular place. Such a place is nothing without the wolves and bears.

ADFG cannot be given full reign to implement an aerial gunning program that would weaken and endanger wolf and bear populations. Man-made numbers which have no scientific backing cannot be supported by a program of lethal killing left unchecked by a department looking for unabated authority to carry out an agenda of hatred on predator species. The state is going in the wrong direction! Please oppose and do not pass this proposal.

We live in a precarious time of climate collapse. Predator killing programs have never been successful other than being obscenely cruel. Let's change history: protect the bears and the wolves, accept the role that humanity has played in environmental degradation and turn it around to support change for them and for humanity. YES! it's that important!!

The aerial gunning and other lethal methods to kill wolves and bears allowed by proposal 75 in Unit 16 near Denali & Lake Clark National Parks - an area that would extend a killing field to hundreds up to thousands of miles - aims to reduce wolf populations by 73-80%. This proposed killing directly threatens ecosystems. The aerial gunning of wolves and bears is unconscionable in this day and age.

say NO to Proposal 75!!!

---



PC1292

**Name:** Raiden Peoper

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

In regard to Proposal 75, I'm in blatant and unyielding opposition. With plans to reduce brown bear populations by 60% in Alaska, with 98% of all brown bears residing WITHIN Alaska, such an impact could reduce brown bear numbers to as little as 40% in Alaska and 42% nationwide. I see this as an unnecessary pursuit, understanding that caribou populations are on the decline as well, but this still lacks any justification. It is immoral to trade one animal's population in favor of another unless one such population is invasive. Relocation of either species is difficult but nevertheless an option, just as there are many others. Expanding on an aforementioned notion, brown bears are apex predators. To remove such an incredibly large quantity of their population could have unprecedented repercussions on the ecosystems they affect, causing issues like overpopulation which can lead to a lack of natural resources critical to animals' survival, an issue seen with many hunting game. I rebuke Proposal 75 and the fact that it has even made it to consideration is disheartening.

---



PC1293

**Name:** Nicoleta Pervu

**Community of Residence:** NY

**Comment:**

Opposition of proposal 75. Bears and wolves need to be protected.

---



PC1294

**Name:** Cindy Petersen

**Community of Residence:** Box Elder county utah

**Comment:**

Proposal #75 Please please don't do this to these animals. The ecosystem needs them to balance it out. We need them. This is a complete disgrace to murder these animals. The wolves and bears are n9t 7sed as a source of food. This Proposal is for nothing but the sport to kill. Anyone who supports this is as guilty as the person doing the murdering.



PC1295

**Name:** Austin Peterson

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75, ive hunted that area and there are plenty of other ways to allow hunters to legally harvest the bears. You'll just be wasting bears typical of the government. You get the dumb idea from Canada?

---



PC1296

**Name:** Alexis Peterson

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

No. 75. No grizzly/brown bears or wolves should be killed at any time or in any manner.

---



PC1297

**Name:** Xander Peterson

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the killing of all bears or wolves. No.75.

---



PC1298

**Name:** Kaitlin Petschke

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I'm writing this in opposition of proposal 75. I visited Alaska back in August and did a bear viewing in Lake Clark National Park. I live in Colorado and the wildlife out here is amazing, but Alaska is other worldly. The pristine landscape, the uninterrupted wildlife and habitats left me speechless. We have seen such a drastic collision of human and wildlife lifestyle here in Colorado and the negative impacts that it has had on conservation, wildlife numbers, and our national parks, it's despicable. These lands are not ours, we are simply visitors that should be leaving these habitats better than we found them. I can't even begin to understand the mindset of politicians where they think they have the right to kill a huge population of bears in one of the most untouched parts of the world, and for what, profit? These national parks were established for a reason and remain difficult to get to to leave them pristine for future

generations to enjoy and educate themselves about. Take it from someone who has seen how much national park conservation has changed because of human interaction, whether is the ability to build close to or on national park land, roadway and railway expansion, oil fracking, ski resorts, mining, and so much more. Colorado will never be the same and it's defeating to watch. Leave Alaska, it's national parks and their inhabitants alone. Let there be something left for future generations to enjoy and be proud of, for money isn't the reason for living, experiences are.

---



PC1299

**Name:** Kali Pevonka

**Community of Residence:** Nebraska

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75 of removing upwards of 70% of native wildlife including bears and wolves in Alaska in areas surrounding protected National Parks, which is proposed with limited to no scientific studies on impacts to both the wildlife and our ecosystems.

---



PC1300

**Name:** Danielle Pfeifle

**Community of Residence:** Frisco, Texas

**Comment:**

I am here regarding proposal 75. I am opposed. Killing so much wildlife is inhumane and absolutely damaging.

---



PC1301

**Name:** Bridget Phillips

**Community of Residence:** Idaho

**Comment:**

Please reconsider Proposal 75. Predators are an important part of any ecosystem and there are ways to mitigate impacts other than mass culling.

---



PC1302

**Name:** Sharon Philpott

**Community of Residence:** Klickitat County, Washington State

**Comment:**

I am OPPOSED to Proposal 75. This is not conservation. You would be killing wildlife in an area that is adjacent to Lake Clark National Park, one of the last pristine black bear habitats. The brown bear population there is already under extreme threat there from other proposals (Johnson Mine for example). By authorizing the killing of bears (you use a nicer term like removal but you mean kill) in this area you will impact the Lake Clark bear population. I OPPOSE this proposal. Do the right thing for wildlife conservation and remove this proposal!

---



PC1303

**Name:** Katie Pierce

**Community of Residence:** Miami

**Comment:**

Please oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1304

**Name:** Hasley Pierce

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75!!

---



PC1305

**Name:** Cristina Pijuan Casis

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

Re: Proposal 75 - I oppose the inhumane killing of wildlife who call the Alaskan wilderness their home just so humans can get their hunting fix.

---



PC1306

**Name:** Claire Pikor

**Community of Residence:** Lake Clark, Alaska

**Comment:**

Opposing Proposal 75

Hello,

I am writing to express my sincere concern about Proposal 75 and am strongly opposed to the aerial gunning of Alaska's brown bear population. My position is deeply rooted in the recognition of the ecological, emotional, and cultural significance of these animals. Bears contribute to nutrient cycling by dispersing seeds and marine nutrients across large areas. Removing these animals from the ecosystem can lead to unintended consequences, such as population imbalances or the degradation of natural habitats.

These are not just animals; they are cherished beings that contribute to a sense of wonder and awe. Being able to observe these animals helps me, as well as others, foster a deep connection to the land and its wildness. They represent the untamed beauty of Alaska, which many people, including myself and visitors, hold intensely dear. Furthermore, they are a major tourist attraction, and removing such majestic creatures could be detrimental to Alaska's economy.

The act of gunning these bears down is not a long-term solution but an immediate "fix," which would, in turn, cause greater damage than good. It does not address the root causes of population issues, such as habitat destruction, climate change, or human encroachment. A holistic and natural approach is needed so that humans, our children, and our children's children can coexist sustainably in Alaska's diverse ecosystem.

Best,

Claire Bear

---



PC1307

**Name:** Jennifer Pinckney

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75.

---



PC1308

**Name:** Lareyna Plescher

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I am a concerned citizen, especially regarding Proposal 75. The destruction that will cause on the environment is insurmountable and not within reason.

---



PC1309

**Name:** Kathryn Podgorski

**Community of Residence:** Lansing

**Comment:**

Please Oppose Prop 75. It represents terrible management of wolves and bears, two species that provide tremendous benefit to the health and integrity of their ecosystems.

---



PC1310

**Name:** Alessandra Politi

**Community of Residence:** Broomfield, CO

**Comment:**

Please don't let proposal 75 pass. Conservation of wildlife is vital to the ecosystem and our environment. It's not fair to the animals or our planet.

---



PC1311

**Name:** Keri Pollock

**Community of Residence:** Orlando, Florida

**Comment:**

Hello,

I'm a concerned college student majoring in environmental studies at the University of Central Florida. I'm writing to you all because I'm very concerned with the plan proposed by proposal 75. Although this plan has the intentions to protect moose calves, it will ultimately bring about negative impacts to the predator population and the natural resources moose need to survive. As you are aware, predators limit the prey population and that allows for vegetation eaten by moose and other herbivores to grow back. Removing 70% of the predators will destroy the social hierarchy of wolf packs, making it less likely for them to do this task or any other task. As seen in Yellowstone National Park, decreasing wolf population was so detrimental to their ecosystem balance that they had to spend extra funding and time to undo their

damages. This is exactly what would happen if this proposal is executed out. I believe that this would do more harm than good and I would hate to see this happen.

If you were to modify this proposal, maybe it wouldn't be threatening. Instead of killing 70% of the population, focus on relocating 30%. This would allow for the moose calves to have a better chance at survival, while not damaging the predator population to the point of no return. Providing strict hunting regulations, so that the repopulation of these animals can be done would be another solution. Overall, this proposal is not productive for keeping a balanced and healthy ecosystem and will end up costing more in funding to fix these future problems.

Thank you for your time and I hope proposal 75 does not pass or get any approval because the it would damage the ecosystem of 16B.

All the best,

Keri Pollock

---



PC1312

**Name:** Karina Polselli

**Community of Residence:** Tampa, FL

**Comment:**

I am commenting on Proposal 75. I do not support this proposal. These animals are natural wonders and should not be unjustifiably killed. Population control is a slippery slope, and we have seen already how easily animal groups can become endangered or extinct. Please protect these wild animals and do not allow this proposal to pass.

---



PC1313

**Name:** Sid Poly

**Community of Residence:** Idaho

**Comment:**

Population control? For Proposal 75. Please. This is not needed, keep the wild wild and stop touching it

---



PC1314

**Name:** Rachel Pool

**Community of Residence:** UK

**Comment:**

I oppose to proposal 75. As a conservationist and scientist, the killing of predators which regulate the ecosystem are vital to the health and resilience of this ecological community. The ungulate prey densities, which without predation of wolves and bears will damage the habitat. The increase in global temperatures

and frequency of storms and droughts will put pressure on an ecosystem which without trophies cascades will degrade and become more vulnerable to pathogens and stress related disturbances. Humans are pushing nature towards an increasingly precarious situation by not understanding the importance of self regulating ecosystems which should be left to find an equilibrium which will occur due to limiting factors. It is foolish not to listen to science which, has tried to warn humanity of the consequences of pushing nature to its limits which will have a lasting impact of the ecosystem services we also rely upon for our survival.

---



PC1315

**Name:** Patty Potter

**Community of Residence:** Guilford

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposition 75. I am a professional photographer and photograph bears in lake Clark every summer

---



PC1316

**Name:** Brittany Powell

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Oppose 75

Aerial shooting of predators is not appropriate for the region or its inhabitants. We need more wildlife, not less. Think of something less ridiculous. The bears are already suffering from lack of salmon.

---



PC1317

**Name:** Nick Power

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

There is a lot of wolves in unit 16 as I have seen recreating in this unit. Moose numbers are way down in population. I do actively trap and hunt this unit as I have a semi remote cabin there.

Having government employees carry out this task is not something I support. Government is inefficient and careless. A much more efficient and meaningful proposal would be for the government to incentivize the harvest. Let the free and open market pursue this effort. If the government would pay licensed hunters and trappers \$1000.00-\$3000.00 per wolf this would be far cheaper than the government doing this task.

---



PC1318

**Name:** Paula Powers

**Community of Residence:** Harwich

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposition 75 on the grounds that it is a public and moral atrocity that would shame Alaska before the world. It is unscientific, unecological, uneconomical, and unethical.

---



PC1319

**Name:** Aswathy pradeep kumar

**Community of Residence:** India

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits of wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, attracting millions of visitors annually.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1320

**Name:** Samantha Prado

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75!!!!

---



PC1321

**Name:** Tyler Pratt

**Community of Residence:** Colorado Springs, Colorado

**Comment:**

Tyler Pratt

75 - opposing: This s/ r/ on Diddy. The entire f/ point of national parks is to preserve and protect the natural world so future generations can see it. And now you want to go kill off the nearly extinct wild wolves, who have intricate family bonds. Not only that but thousands of bears and they have no chance of survival because you're using a f/ helicopter with rifles. Not even to eat them, or protect, it's for sport and money. What do you (yes you the person reading this) personally gain from this? Money? Do you really need more of that, is your family in poverty or do you want a cool watch? If you really needed money that bad you could go out on the street and beg for it, but you don't. It's for sport. You might lie to yourself if you cared and say it's for protection, but it's f/ nature. It existed for billions of years and balanced itself out without the need to go r/ (touch without consent) little wild dogs with your big fun rifle.

---



PC1322

**Name:** Jessica Presley

**Community of Residence:** Springfield, MO

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence. Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration

---



PC1323

**Name:** Grace Preston

**Community of Residence:** Bedford New Hampshire

**Comment:**

I find it completely unacceptable that Proposal 75 to remove wolves, brown bears, and black bears out of Unit 16. One of the reasons why I choose to travel to Alaska is to witness such wildlife in their native habitat. This move would be devastating and have a huge impact on tourism dollars. Please consider that these species are more valuable alive than dead. Should Proposal 75 be enacted, I will gladly spend my tourism dollars in Canada or elsewhere in places that look to preserve and conserve such natural resources.

---



PC1324

**Name:** Michelle Price

**Community of Residence:** California USA

**Comment:**

Reducing populations of wildlife in Alaska is not management nor responsible nor humane- I reject and oppose this proposal 75 as its an annihilation of animals and definitely not responsible stewardship, which is what we as humans are obligated to do on earth with all its flora/fauna. Please do the right thing and remove this proposal.

---



PC1325

**Name:** Alexxis Proskey

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

This is beyond sickening to kill innocent life. This area partially borders and partially encompasses not one but two national parks. To try and allow helicopters traumatize wildlife and then shooting them is

grotesque. How do you know it's an accurate shot? How will you not kill any other animal that's not targeted? What about the shell casings? How is other wildlife gonna know not to eat it? There's so many things wrong with this Proposal. Please do the right human thing and oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1326

**Name:** Ashley Pullium

**Community of Residence:** Kansas city

**Comment:**

I would like to make it clear that OPPOSE 75. These are keystone species that the world needs they need to be protected, not gunned down

---



PC1327

**Name:** Graeme Purdy

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Populations grow, the environment is coming under more pressure from all sorts of issues, but least climate change. We should be doing all we can to protect and preserve nature. I strongly object the idea of Proposal 75, this is entirely short sighted

---



PC1328

**Name:** Heather Purvis

**Community of Residence:** Busselton, Western Australia

**Comment:**

**Conservation and Economic Risks:** Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities

Whilst I live in Australia, I have travelled to the Katmai area of Alaska twice solely for the purpose of photographing bears and wolves, just like many other international tourists. If these animals are decimated I will be looking elsewhere to spend my tourist dollars.

**Inhumane and Unethical Methods:** Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

**Threat to Ecosystem Balance:** Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

Lack of Transparency and Oversight: Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

---



**Name:** Heather Quick

**Community of Residence:** New York, New York

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to Proposal 75 as a concerned member of the public. I oppose the slaughter of healthy animals in the name of “management.” Healthy animals can manage their own populations without being shot at from helicopters. This is blatantly pandering to weaker trophy hunters.

Since money talks, please consider that peaceful, nonviolent enjoyment of Alaska’s wild areas is accessible to more people, also interesting and educational to more people than trophy hunting and will bring in more revenue over time than the polluting, unsportsmanlike “hunting” that this selfish and short-sighted proposal allows.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please vote No on Proposition 75.

---



## Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I'm Koyukon Athabascan of the Caribou Clan and a member of a federally recognized Tribe. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in wildlife biology and conservation and I'm furthering my education with a masters in natural resources and environment. I have worked and conducted research across the state, and I'm actively involved in various wildlife working groups to share my unique perspective, combining both Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Western Science. I definitely have a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of fish and wildlife in Alaska.

### Introduction

The recent large-scale killing of predators in Alaska is unprecedented since statehood and lacks public information, comment, and scientific support. This action should not have occurred and must not happen again. In the past, shooting bison from moving trains and leaving them to rot was a common practice. However, attitudes have evolved and so has our understanding of the importance of predators. Recent research indicates that predators play a crucial role in stabilizing ecosystems and may help mitigate some effects of climate change<sup>1</sup>. Other studies suggest that predators can help prey species adapt more quickly to changing conditions<sup>2</sup>. I worry that just as Alaska's wildlife faces new pressures in a warming world, management priorities are reverting to outdated approaches in how we treat wildlife.

### Background

At a Board of Game meeting in 2022, state biologists reported that the 10-year wolf predator control program, which killed over 450 wolves, had no effect on the Mulchatna caribou population decline and needed reconsideration. Despite this, the board expanded the wolf-killing program to an adjacent federal wildlife refuge and included brown and black bears without public review or comment. There was no biological study conducted on either bears or wolves, no opportunity for public engagement, and no public notice it was even happening. The agency tends to dismiss criticism of its predator control programs when there are valid scientific questions about its effectiveness.

Similar culling's in the past have also gone unnoticed. In 2016, for example, the federal government shared radio tag information with the state, which then used it to kill wolves when they left the safety of the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, destroying so many packs that it ended a 20-year study on predator-prey relationships. There weren't enough survivors to maintain a self-sustaining population. Yet, the nearby caribou herd still failed to recover.

This intensive management plan should be discontinued and replaced with one that is science-based, biologically achievable, with sustainable population and harvest objectives.

### Scientific Evidence Against Predator Control

Studies show no long-term benefits of predator control on moose populations. A comprehensive study published in the peer-reviewed journal *Diversity* analyzed 40 years of data from Game Management Unit 13 and found no long-term correlation between predator reduction and increased moose harvests<sup>3</sup>.

The study highlighted that short-term increases in moose harvests observed in some periods were not sustained over the long-term, indicating that predator control is not an effective strategy for



enhancing moose populations (Miller, S. D., Person, D. K., & Bowyer, R. T. 2022). This finding is critical as it underscores the importance of considering long-term ecological impacts rather than relying on short-term observations that may be misleading.

Miller, a co-author of the study, was also involved in one of the agencies best examples of predator relocations in 1979 where they moved 47 brown bears from south-central Alaska, which resulted in a “significant” increase in the survival of moose calves the next fall. But Miller confirmed that the department often misquotes that work. Due to lack of funding, Miller didn’t study the young animals long enough to see if they reached adulthood. Similarly, the department conducted an aerial survey to find that more calves survived after the Mulchatna bear culling. However, biologists know that’s not the best metric to measure the operations success and calves may have still perished during their first winter.

Particularly when a moose population is near carrying capacity, calf mortality is compensatory, meaning they die from other causes. Thus, calf mortality is not additive, and this means that even if all predators are eliminated, the calves would still die from other factors, as predation is not the limiting factor. This means that removing predators does not necessarily lead to an increase in prey numbers, as other factors (such as disease, starvation, or environmental conditions) will still cause mortality.

The commissioner’s refusal to endorse an independent scientific review of the state’s predator control programs conducted by the National Academies of Sciences/National Research Council betrays its lack of confidence in the reputability of its predator control programs. Any decent scientist or resource policy maker would invite independent scientific review of a significant program such as this, particularly as it is so controversial, and so widely criticized by many Alaskans, including many scientists, even those from within the department.

### **Ecological Impact**

Wolves and bears are keystone species essential for a healthy ecosystem. Removing them disrupts natural balances and can lead to unforeseen negative consequences with cascading effects on the environment. It is well known among wildlife biologists that reducing limiting factors may cause moose and caribou to increase, at times to levels where they damage their own habitat and decline sharply. The department cannot accurately estimate natural mortality versus predation. We know that wolves pick out the injured, diseased, and old to help maintain a healthy population. Those individuals that would have died from injury or disease, and their removal by predators, reduce competition for food and resources, improving the herds overall health.

Wolves and bears are known to prey on weaker animals, which may have helped keep brucellosis levels down in the Mulchatna herd. By 2017, 250 wolves had been killed as part of the original Mulchatna predator control program, and the caribou herd's numbers declined rapidly around the same time. When we eliminate wolves to boost caribou numbers, the weak and diseased caribou remain, suffering and spreading infections. Without predators to cull the sick, more diseased animals are left to infect the herd.

### **Wolves and Bears**



Wolves reproduce more when their numbers are reduced, making wolf control efforts counterproductive. They naturally manage their population through cannibalism and competition. Removing a wolf pack allows other wolves or coyotes to move in. Wolves are social animals that pass on crucial survival skills and how to be a wolf within their packs. Killing many wolves disrupts this knowledge transfer, making younger wolves more desperate and bolder.

Similarly, removing bears is complex. Bears prey on their own species for territory, resources, and genetic advantages. Killing a dominant male bear can lead to more bears moving into the area, further complicating population control.

### **Legal and Ethical Issues**

The lack of data and public involvement in decision-making, as well as historical examples of poor management decisions, highlight the need for a more balanced and scientifically sound approach. The recent actions of gunning down nearly 100 brown bears in 17 days were shocking and regressive, reflecting a brutal management style and a system that's out of control. The exclusion of public testimony and the lack of independent scientific review undermine the credibility of the Board of Game and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

### **Recommendations**

- Reject Proposal 75.
- Adopt sustainable, humane wildlife management practices.
- Create wildlife corridors to maintain healthy ecosystems and enhance biodiversity.
  - The Parks highway runs concurrently with GMU 16, and vehicle collisions are a major risk and cause of mortality for ungulates.
  - Even though there is a roadkill list, you cannot ensure that most of the meat is edible after a collision.
- Ensure broad representation on the Board of Game
  - Designated seats will help ensure adequate representation, more diverse perspectives, and a broadly based membership.
- Improve interagency, Tribal, and stakeholder collaboration.

### **Conclusion**

Implementing Proposal 75 would not only fail to achieve its intended goals but also pose significant ethical and ecological concerns. I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which seeks to add the removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears to Unit 16's Intensive Management Plan. Scientific evidence does not support that predator control leads to increased moose harvests. I strongly urge the Board to reject Proposal 75 and instead embrace sustainable and humane wildlife management practices. It is crucial that we prioritize the protection of our natural ecosystems, guided by sound scientific research and ethical principles.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Quillin

---



- [1](#): Ripple, W. J., & Beschta, R. L. (2012). Trophic cascades in Yellowstone: The first 15 years after wolf reintroduction. *Biological Conservation*, 145(1), 205-213.
  - [2](#): Estes, J. A., Terborgh, J., Brashares, J. S., Power, M. E., Berger, J., Bond, W. J., ... & Wardle, D. A. (2011). Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. *Science*, 333(6040), 301-306.
  - [3](#): Miller, S. D., Person, D. K., & Bowyer, R. T. (2022). Long-term effects of predator control on moose harvests in Alaska. *Diversity*, 14(1), 40-55.
-



PC1331

**Name:** Sarah Raby

**Community of Residence:** Colorado Springs, Colorado

**Comment:**

opposed - severely to prop 75.

---



PC1332

**Name:** Dr. Sam Rad

**Community of Residence:** Montana

**Comment:**

Regarding proposal 75, I strongly OPPOSE. I have plans of visiting Alaska national parks because of the wilderness and wildlife, but if the animals are being killed as proposed, I will not support it, I will not visit. Does Alaska rely on tourism for its economy? People only come to see the wilderness and wildlife. Why would you propose killing the animals if it means people will stop visiting and spending money there? As a doctor in Montana, I am able to understand the importance of all natural parts within the system. Man cannot improve what nature has created. We must leave the animals alone. We must leave the wilderness to be wild. Humans should keep to themselves. And electric fences work! Learn how to use them and you will appreciate the low impact defense it provides, and keeps the animals living naturally, away from human food sources. Do the right thing: reject proposal 75. Thank you.

---



PC1333

**Name:** Mariah Ragland

**Community of Residence:** Nashville

**Comment:**

Propose 75, inhumane, evil, and should not be allowed to happen. A country is only as good as it treats its animals.

---



PC1334

**Name:** Peter Rainville

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

#75 to reduce Alaska Peninsula and unit 16 wolf and bear population, 100 per year. I am 100% in favor of reducing the wolf and bear population in these and other areas and units. The moose population is drastically low, the bears are underweight and starving in some areas. Soon there will be no animals left at the rate it's going. It's a shame that it has to get to this condition before we can do anything. It's mostly opposition from outside influence. It should be only Alaskans who decide. Alaska for Alaskans.

---



PC1335

**Name:** Alexis Ramirez

**Community of Residence:** McHenry IL

**Comment:**

Opposed to proposal 75. There is no need to allow hunting within those boundaries. This will have a huge negative affect on our wildlife.

---



PC1336

**Name:** Nikki Ramirez

**Community of Residence:** Laguna Hills

**Comment:**

OPPOSE Proposal 75. Please reconsider this horrific decision. I am a full time working mother of a 2 year old and 5 year old. Don't you want your children to have nature and animals when they grow older? Don't you want a natural world and not a world of concrete?! Please I want my children to see these animals exist when they have children and their children's children. I don't live here but if I could move there I would! There is absolutely no reason for this!!! No reason for the massive murder of bears and wolves and any kind of predators. I am begging you. God does not want this. Jesus doesn't want this. Whatever you believe in, please listen to reason and do not murder these creatures.

---



PC1337

**Name:** grace rana

**Community of Residence:** ohio

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75 because these animals should not be culled

---



PC1338

**Name:** Robin Randolph

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

75 PROPOSAL --- I WHOLE HEARTILY OPPOSE OF THIS....This is just wrong on all accounts, the wildlife, Bears, wolves, ect., need to be protected on all accounts. We can not keep killing these magnificent animals and think that all will be ok

God gave us dominion over them but not to just shoot and take their lives. They are here for reasons. If Alaska kills and Montana, Colorado, Tennessee, and other states ,look at what will happen. We cannot put these beautiful animals on an endangered list again. What if humans were treated the same way. I

mean look at it honestly, our food supply , with farmers having a hard time because of weather, the orange groves that have been damaged by fires and hurricanes, the list goes on,maybe we should

thin out humans seeing how we may not have enough food. It doesn't make since right ?. Killing these animals doesn't make since either. I would hate to know that I went out to find food for my family to survive and out of nowhere over my head I am running for my life and my family running for theirs just because we wanted to eat. They only take what they need, unlike humans who are full of greed. We encroach on their territory and want to control their lives. ITS JUST WRONG. Please, Please do not pass this, let nature handle nature. This is not right, they have as much right to this earth as we do. We are what is WRONG not them. Leave them be. We are trying to stop them in Florida also because the human population keeps expanding into the territory of the wildlife they are thinking of hunting the bears, this is what I'm talking about, now imagine every state doing this, it's not going to end well for our wildlife, we need to protect them not kill them, we are the problem. Thank you for your time.

---



PC1339

**Name:** Piper Rasmussen

**Community of Residence:** Thunder Bay

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Intentionally and forcefully reducing the population size of wolves and bears is cruel and barbaric, and also reckless from an ecological standpoint. All animals have a right to live and to exist as part of their ecosystem. They are not pests or threats to humans, they are our very important neighbours. I don't even live in Alaska or the US but as a Canadian we share this land (which we have NO claim over in the first place!) and we share it with the wild animals too. Please leave them be!

---



PC1340

**Name:** Bella Reber

**Community of Residence:** Dakota

**Comment:**

Im writing about proposal 75. As a resident in an area that once had wolves, it is detrimental that you keep predator species alive and do not have kill quotas. These animals are detrimental to our ecosystem, and killing them will only cause further harm to our environment. The earth thrives in harmony and this will only upset that harmony even more. Not to mention these animals are being attacked by all sects of society and need to be protected before they are extinct; with the rampant habitat lost I do not think this is an outrageous claim.

Not to mention it is extreme government oversight to have quotas for animal deaths. Our military should not be used against these animals. Instead to protect farmers and caribou, these animals should be tagged so we can monitor their movements. And if these animals are such a detrimental threat then hunting quotas should be increased for the people in this community so they can achieve an economic benefit rather than unnecessary military death.

---



PC1341

**Name:** Austin Rector

**Community of Residence:** LeClaire, Iowa

**Comment:**

I am opposing proposal 75 as the reduction numbers that are proposed will decimate the population of both species that are already struggling in other parts of the country

---



PC1342

**Name:** Quincy Mathews, Redoubt Mountain lodge

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75, because it will affect the job we do at our lodge at Redoubt. Reducing bear numbers, and all wild life numbers at the rate in the proposal seems unusual, and unnecessary.

---



PC1343

**Name:** Shera Zebb, Redoubt Mountain Lodge

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal #75. Having lived and worked seasonally in Lake Clark National Park for many years, including at Redoubt Mountain Lodge, I've witnessed the vital role that bear and wolf populations play in maintaining the park's ecosystem. Reducing these populations would have irreversible ecological consequences and disrupt the balance of the park's wildlife. Additionally, this proposal would negatively impact tourism, which is crucial for the local economy. Protecting the park's natural environment and wildlife is essential for both its health and the future of the community. There is absolutely no reason for this proposal to be so drastic. Strongly oppose again.

---



PC1344

**Name:** Anne Reed

**Community of Residence:** Arundel, Maine

**Comment:**

I am writing in regard to Proposal 75. I am saddened and outraged to hear the proposal to kill 60% of the brown bears in Unit 16 via aerially gunning them down. You have one of the most important conservation areas for these animals. I understand the concern for the ungulate population. However, gradually increasing predator hunting tags to guard against a boom and bust cycle would seem to be a much more thoughtful approach, rather than this decision to simply gun the bears down without thought to the effect on local economies or natural resources.

---



PC1345

**Name:** Chris Reed

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

I am strongly opposed to Proposal 75

---



PC1346

**Name:** Jason Refuerzo

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposal 75. please do not move forward with it.

---



PC1347

**Name:** Colleen Reilly

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage home base

**Comment:**

I had to read Proposal 75 multiple times to believe what i am reading. While i understand the need to control wildlife population given expanding human presence, this seems a short sighted plan and frankly, sounds like a wolf/bear blood bath. What alternative, more humane solutions were considered? How about relocation? Birth control? What happens if the department allows nature to control overpopulation? Humans intervening now will create a permanent human-required solution, hardly a sustainable solution or ecologically sound one. Please consider other solutions to what i imagine is this 'cheap' solution.

---



PC1348

**Name:** Kayla Reiter

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I would like to oppose proposal 75. The wildlife was here before we were, and we need to continue to coexist. These living beings deserve respect and not to be killed. Please.

---



PC1349

**Name:** Nick Remesz

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Oppose

We have seen time and again the impacts that humans have had on attempting to control animal populations. We nearly caused the American Bison to go extinct, and now have to have open game seasons nationwide on prey animals on overabundance such as the whitetail deer because we removed all of their predators. Isle Royale National Park is still in a dance of uncertainty even with the reintroduction of wolves, as the most common cause of death for Moose on the island is still starvation - the nature of nature is held in a delicate balance, and humans simply cannot understand it. Nature will run its course and must do so without our intervention. Humans must stop attempting to play god. Every time they do, everyone loses.

---



PC1350

**Name:** Dara Brodey, Rewilding Apennines

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

Proposal 75, opposition.

As an Italian and American citizen, I would like to express my total opposition to this immoral and unscientific management plan.

Such important decisions must be taken according to scientific evidence.

Scientific literature indicates climate change as the main cause of the reduction in the number of caribou. Intervening heavily on the number of carnivores is probably ineffective, besides being a reversion to an outdated and counterproductive management conception.

As a voice of the international community of citizens caring for this planet and its precious ecosystems, I strongly urge to vote against proposition 75, which would be shameful and a failure of the Alaskan government, in the eyes of the world.

---



PC1351

**Name:** Angela Tavone, Rewilding Apennines

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

I'm commenting the proposal n. 75. I oppose this proposal because the cull of wolves and bears to mitigate the reduction of caribou population is a non-sense from a scientific point of view, as the decline of this species clearly depends on climate change effects. Moreover, the image of "wild Alaska" would be irremediably ruined for the international audience if this bloodshed were enforced.

---



PC1352

**Name:** Fabrizio Cordischi, Rewilding Apennines ETS

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 opposition. There is no scientific support for this action.

---



PC1353

**Name:** Erin Reynolds

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE proposal 75.

Not only is this approach inhumane, but studies show that killing native carnivores will not solve the larger issues behind moose population decline. Bears and wolves are not the primary cause of dwindling moose numbers; rather, this complex issue involves habitat loss, climate change and other ecological factors.

---



PC1354

**Name:** Kristin Reynolds

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage Alaska

**Comment:**

Prop 75 I am opposed.

These animals were here long before humans moved into the area. They are essential to the ecosystem. They also provide livelihood to photography guides who observe these creatures alive. They are able to bring in people from around the globe to experience them ALIVE, and 1 animal can offer this to many people over and over. Think of 399, and see how she brought people to respect the beauty of wild animals. It is atrocious and selfish to think that killing these animals is a benefit. It is simply greed, to allow 1 person to take the life so no one else can enjoy observing them.



PC1355

**Name:** Brandon Rhea

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Thank you for your time and reading my comment. I would like to strongly oppose proposal 75. I believe it to be an overreaction without valid cause.

---



PC1356

**Name:** Keaton Rhea

**Community of Residence:** Spring branch

**Comment:**

As a Texan that dreams of the wild that Alaska brings the news of proposal 75 seems extensively overreaching in its goals to eliminate the predator threat and couldn't possibly be a sustainable way to deal with the issue much less be effective in any way but destruction.

---



PC1357

**Name:** Jake Richards

**Community of Residence:** Logan, Utah

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. The science of predator control to manage wildlife populations is murky at best, and undermines Alaska's more sustainable ecotourism industry.

---



PC1358

**Name:** Michael Richardson

**Community of Residence:** North Carolina

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. Please let nature do its thing in reducing the number of wolves and/or bears. Would the State or has the State considered relocation of the animals in order to reduce numbers? Is there somewhere that you could move them to as a more ethical & humane choice? A mass gunning down by overhead aircraft seems a bit drastic & also expensive due to cost of ammunition and aircraft fuel not to mention the amount of labor hours. Please consider other humane ways to manage. Save the wolves & bears!

---



PC1359

**Name:** Beverly Richardson

**Community of Residence:** Petersburg

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I adamantly oppose this proposal as it would authorize ADFG staff to kill black bears, brown bears, and wolves with the use of aircraft, including helicopters, in all of Game Unit 16 to “achieve [predator] reduction goals”.

This is so wrong. This area is between protected areas for these species and should be managed similarly. To do else wise would be a crime.

I continue to be furious of the past ariel killing of bears. It was pure slaughter. I was so ashamed to be an Alaskan when explaining this slaughter to others. Besides that it has been found in that case that the bears were not the primary reason for a decrease in the herd.

Now studies have shown that the wolves targeted too are not the primary problem.

Ariel shooting is cruel and non-sportsman. That is why it is not permitted.

For goodness sake, oppose this proposal.

---



PC1360

**Name:** Angelika Richter

**Community of Residence:** Brooklyn

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75.

I strongly oppose the proposal to allow aerial spotting of bears and wolves in Alaska. Such practices undermine ethical wildlife management and contradict the principles of fair chase hunting. Using aircraft to locate animals gives hunters an unfair advantage, disrupting the natural balance and behavior of wildlife.

Additionally, this approach risks overharvesting already vulnerable populations, particularly predators like wolves and bears, which play a critical role in maintaining healthy ecosystems. Aerial spotting can lead to unnecessary stress on wildlife, disturbing their natural patterns and habitats.

Furthermore, many people, both residents and visitors, value Alaska’s wilderness for its pristine nature and ethical hunting traditions. Allowing aerial spotting tarnishes Alaska's reputation for responsible wildlife stewardship and sets a dangerous precedent for unsustainable hunting practices.

I urge decision-makers to reject this proposal and instead focus on protecting Alaska's wildlife and the integrity of its natural ecosystems.

Thank you!

---



PC1361

**Name:** Teri Ridlon

**Community of Residence:** Wyoming

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75. I visit the Lake Clark region for bear viewing. This proposition is excessive.

---



PC1362

**Name:** Alex Rieflin

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

Commenting on proposal 75 and I oppose. I understand population management may be necessary but I don't think randomly killing predators is the answer. Increasing predator tags would help economically and allow for the local community to benefit and reduce waste of the organisms. I feel that would be more beneficial for everyone involved.

---



PC1363

**Name:** Cody Riner

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

No to proposal 75. Removing 4/5 of the wolf population is genuinely ridiculous no matter the reason. This needs to be shut down immediately. Absolutely awful that this was even proposed.

---



PC1364

**Name:** Brandon Rios

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Stop massacring wildlife! If you wouldn't want it done to you and your family then don't do it to others!

---



PC1365

**Name:** Lydia Ripplinger

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

Lydia Ripplinger

I strongly oppose proposal 75. Aerial shooting should not be the answer to predator control. It is too drastic and too final. Reducing predator numbers has a far-reaching effect that needs to be watched, studied, and monitored over time. Aerial reductive methods are not conducive to the necessary careful monitoring of the reduction of key species in an ecosystem.

Careful and gradual increase of predator hunting tags is a better solution. Not only would this boost the local economy, but it would guard against boom and bust cycles in wildlife populations. It is a better solution if predator numbers need to be reduced-- which is a question that can only be answered with long-term, in-depth studies conducted by biologists, conservationists, and other professionals in the field.

Please reconsider; please do not move forward with proposal 75.

Thank you,

Concerned citizens worldwide

---



PC1366

**Name:** Kristin Riser

**Community of Residence:** Helena Montana

**Comment:**

Opposing proposal 75. Gunning down a large population of wolves and bears will not solve anything. This is absolutely ridiculous and not fair to the natural cycle of things. I am super disappointed this is even being considered. Being a resident in Montana I have seen the destruction of grizzly populations and how they almost got wiped out because people were careless. Alaska has so many beautiful and wild animals that have healthy populations and it needs to stay that way

---



PC1367

**Name:** Nikki Rivera

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

OPPOSE prop 75. This is absurd. Who are we as humans to deter the population of animals. Nature will take its course if there is scarcity of food in the region for the bears, but I believe that we are the visitors in their habitat and killing healthy bears is unjustified

---



PC1368

**Name:** Jessica Rivera

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Bears and wolves should be protected.

---



PC1369

**Name:** Cassia Rivera

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I emphatically and categorically OPPOSE Proposition 75 as it relates to the arial hunting down of large carnivores. There is no scientific proof that this archaic and outdated form of "management" will in fact increase the harvest of other animals. Please see the research and study published under retired Alaska Department of Wildlife and Fisheries researchers that focused their study in Denali National Park. It is also a barbaric practice to fly over wildlife and gun them down. We must do better than this! Alaskan wildlife deserves to live wild and free and allow nature to take it's course as it was intended without the consequences of destructive human intervention. Habitat loss, fragmentation, and destructive human actions are taking Earth's wildlife at a rapid pace. Please stand up and do what's right to protect the incredible wildlife of Alaska and be an example to the other 49 states that hunting down apex predators (who are critical to keeping our ecosystems in balance) in large numbers is NOT the way!

---



PC1370

**Name:** Marissa Roberts

**Community of Residence:** San Diego, CA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is inhumane and unethical. We need to do better to protect the wild animals that call this land their home. We've already reduced their population and endangered them enough be encroaching on their habitat, why do we as humans continue to destroy animal lives and call it conservation or anything positive when it's cruel and barbaric. It has no place in our modern society. Let's be better

---



PC1371

**Name:** Barry Roberts

**Community of Residence:** NY, USA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75.

I understand and am empathetic to the need to protect the moose population in Unit 16, but Proposal 75 does not constitute a sustainable, ethical or economically optimal solution to this end.

Using helicopter slaughter to eliminate a high number of predators is a high cost that has no return or contribution to the area, and is unethical, going against normal hunting practice. Conversely, predator management over time through ethical hunting allows for sustainable management. It can contribute economically to the area and community and is significantly more humane than indiscriminate mass slaughter.

Additionally the targets appear extreme with no scientific basis. This boom and bust type of approach creates needless risk of harming the ecosystem, as well as having a negative economic impact to the community.

There is no discussion of the impact or proposed remedy on the moose population of poaching. Without this, the predator eradication targets cannot have a sound basis.

Notably, Proposal 75 has no inclusion for any other non-lethal solutions to encourage the moose population such as habitat restoration.

Personally, I am planning a trip to the area in 2025, though if an extreme cull takes place I will no longer invest my time or money in the region as it will likely disappoint. Photographic and ecotourism play such an important part in the area, that if viewing opportunities are significantly impacted then people like me will not come.

I respectfully ask the Alaska Board of Game to reject Proposal 75 and consider more ethical, economically viable and ecologically sound methods to support the moose population.



PC1372

**Name:** Dana Robinson

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 in unit 16. Inhumane and unnecessary.



PC1373

**Name:** Adri Rocha

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

75 oppose



PC1374

**Name:** Laurie Roddick

**Community of Residence:** Telluride

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. These bears, wolves, foxes and other carnivores are a natural wonder. Bear and wolf livelihoods are already under threat from the development of the Johnson Tract Mine and collapsing silver salmon runs. This is not wildlife management for the benefit of populations or hunters, it is a wholesale killing of our country's precious wildlife resource that taxpayers are funding. I oppose Proposal 75.



PC1375

**Name:** Blaithín Rodgers

**Community of Residence:** Ireland

**Comment:**

The natural wildlife should be treated with respect- instead of being gunned down and let to waste. Instead increase natural predators of wolves and bears- or set up rehabilitation centres for creatures that are under-populated in the area. To randomly and cruelly kill these animals is not right- and if a random citizen did this- they would go to prison- why should the government be allowed to do the same and not face any repercussions? It's easy-they should not- and they should not in good conscience allow proposal 75 to go ahead.



PC1376

**Name:** Ruth Rogers

**Community of Residence:** Queens

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Oppose



PC1377

**Name:** Sue Rogers

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - the killing of brown bears.

This killing off the wild animals because they have become a problem to humans has got to stop. Humans should be the caretakers of these beautiful animals. Their hunger is the result of humans. Time to look at the cause of the problems for wildlife instead of taking the easy route and killing them.

This world needs animals and the beauty they provide. Those threatened should go live in a high rise where they can be safe from wildlife.

---



PC1378

**Name:** Nicole Rogers

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which allows the killing of bears and wolves in the Lake Clark area from planes. This practice is inhumane, unethical, and disrupts the natural balance of the ecosystem. Bears and wolves are vital to maintaining healthy ecosystems, and aerial hunting undermines the principles of fair chase and ethical wildlife management.

Lake Clark is a treasured wilderness area that should be preserved for future generations, not turned into a site for reckless predator control. Instead of resorting to aerial hunting, we should focus on sustainable and science-based conservation practices that respect the natural world and its inhabitants.

Please prioritize protecting this unique and irreplaceable ecosystem over unnecessary and harmful practices like aerial predator control.

---



PC1379

**Name:** Nicolas Rohrich

**Community of Residence:** Harris County

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is irresponsible and inhumane method of dealing with an increasing number of wildlife predators. Additional options for mitigating this wildlife issue should be discussed and looked into such as increasing hunting licenses or hiring local hunters/ guides to do the work instead. This will allow for the objective of this proposal to be fulfilled and also benefit the local communities and economies as well. Thank you.

---



PC1380

**Name:** Ronald Rojas

**Community of Residence:** Illinois

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. The predator species like the brown and black bears and wolves are essential to the Alaskan ecosystem and are part of the American legacy. And as these species' populations become more diminished over time, why should we stand by and allow them to become decimated? This decision should be made by the America public, as many tourists who visit Alaska come from the lower 48 who pay to see the wolves and bears in their habitats.

---



PC1381

**Name:** Basil Roman

**Community of Residence:** Ware, MA

**Comment:**

I oppose prop. #75. There is no reason I can imagine that would make it ok to reduce the brown bear population so dramatically by such a brutal, cruel method! There must be a more humane way to slightly reduce the population if that is deemed necessary.

---



PC1382

**Name:** Nathan Rome

**Community of Residence:** Bozeman MT

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose proposition 75. The decision making that led to this is uninformed both economically and ecologically. If the populations of predators should be reduced it should be done by increasing tags slowly to reduce the population in a consistent manner.

---



PC1383

**Name:** Kim Rome

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

I wholeheartedly oppose proposal 75 and support the wellness and upholding of these animals' lives and the prosperity in their natural settings

---



PC1384

**Name:** Yvonne Rong

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Opposing Proposal 75 because there are better ways to deal with the balance of animal life in a region than to just kill them!

---



PC1385

**Name:** Kaylee Roofner

**Community of Residence:** PA

**Comment:**

I am writing on proposal 75. it is absolutely ridiculous that we has humans feel the need to wipe out a large population of WILD animals because humans deem them “overpopulated” it’s THEIR homes!!!!

---



PC1386

**Name:** Paola Rosen

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 , unacceptable to kill these beautiful creatures in their natural habitat, enough damage has been done with all infrastructure. Leave them alone!

---



PC1387

**Name:** Emily Rosenberg

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

I think what is being proposed is an outrage these animals have gone through enough and the idea that they could be shot from airplanes going overhead is an outrageous you should be ashamed Prop 75

---



PC1388

**Name:** Joseph Rosenberger

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is an outrageous and inhumane way of controlling wildlife. The right thing to do would be to gradually increase bear and wolf hunting quotas over the years, which will directly benefit local economies and bring additional funding to wildlife agencies. Instead you will be randomly gunning down these animals from the sky. What is even the point?

---



PC1389

**Name:** Mike Ross

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 -Oppose

This is a waste of taxpayer money and resources. There is no godly reason to cull populations by that much. If you wanted to control them issue limited hunting permits that would at least help the local economy.

---



PC1390

**Name:** Veronica Rossetti

**Community of Residence:** Florida, though I go to Alaska every summer/fall

**Comment:**

Please don't support Proposal 75 Protect our wolves, brown bears, and black bears.

Please support Proposals 82, 11 & 29.

---



PC1391

**Name:** Jake Roth

**Community of Residence:** San Luis Obispo, CA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposition 75. Indiscriminately gunning down carnivores for the sole reason of raising ungulate populations is a waste of resources and a devastating impact to the ecosystem. Please reconsider the need for eliminating carnivore populations. If that is not possible then please reconsider the method of execution. As an example, you could increase the number of allotted hunting permits. This would lead to an increase in revenue for the state and more food for local residents.

---



PC1392

**Name:** Marcia Rothschild

**Community of Residence:** Estes Park, CO

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - OPPOSE. We are losing wildlife left, and right, from fires, from climate change, this is just so wrong.

---



PC1393

**Name:** Brianna Rowland

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose proposal 75 unit 16. Predator control should NOT include the senseless annihilation of a majority of the populations for personal gain such as increased ungulate harvesting. This is a tactless way to reduce the populations. Other options could include increasing the predator tags each year so people and local wildlife services actually benefit from the killing of these predators, rather than the government overtaking a culling a majority of the population. Not to mention that predators are keystone species and are beneficial to ungulate populations, the environment, and especially the neighboring national park that is known for their brown bears. The local brown bear population is already under considerable pressure from the Johnson Tract Mine development harming salmon runs in the area. An additional cull would only cause the population to go into a downward spiral. Please view these predators a valuable members of their ecosystem as well as for the local communities via ecotourism. Please consider a more appropriate way of managing predators, or even a better way to manage the ungulates.

Thank you

---



PC1394

**Name:** Danielle Ruccia

**Community of Residence:** Ronkonkoma

**Comment:**

Oppose prop 75. This is sickening that animals that are living in their natural habitat would be gunned down and killed. This is creating a media frenzy and I hope the ppl that are considering this will be stopped.

---



PC1395

**Name:** Grace Rucker

**Community of Residence:** Leavenworth, WA

**Comment:**

In regard to proposal 75:

I myself live in an area where wildlife management and more specifically, predator management, is a concern. However, we know that predators are crucial to the ecosystem, and that we have dedicated areas for farming and livestock, etc., as does Alaska. This proposal, while I believe well intended, is a senseless and irresponsible measure. We know of better methods for land management and it always involves reintroducing Indigenous knowledge of land maintenance. Land back! Put the earth back in the hands of those who have been unequivocally the most successful at managing the earth! Those who have a

relationship of reciprocity and respect with the land. This proposal is inhumane and we can do so much better.

---



PC1396

**Name:** Ashlynn Rucker

**Community of Residence:** Tooele County

**Comment:**

#75. I oppose this because bear populations are endangered in many parts of the world, if not all. Cutting them down by 60% is ridiculously high and not needed. I think it would fail if the time came to ever try to rebuild the population. Let the bears live. We've lost so many.

---



PC1397

**Name:** Jihyun Rudd

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I am writing for opposition to proposal 75. We need to protect wildlife. Wolves and bears are very important for ecosystem. Yellowstone is a good example. After the ranger killed the last wolf in 1926, deer, elk and bison were overpopulated and destroyed the park. However the wolf reintroduction helped restore the ecosystem. Trees were green and growing, and birds were back in the park. Also, wolves are only hunting for old and sick prays, and their hunting success rate is only 33%. Black bears and brown bears don't hunt as much as wolves do. Brown bears usually get food from carcasses that was killed by other predators or natural causes. Having wolves, black bears and brown bears do NOT affect caribou and deer population. Both caribou and deer usually suffer from constriction and roadkill. We must learned lessons from our past mistakes and protect all kinds of wildlife especially wolves and bears!

---



PC1398

**Name:** nathaniel ruiz

**Community of Residence:** lake tahoe ca

**Comment:**

I oppose the culling of predators and prop 75. The government and private industry has done enough damage to western ecosystems.

---



PC1399

**Name:** Mikaela Ruland

**Community of Residence:** Parker, Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. As a writer who has devoted their career to covering national parks, a lover of wild places and public lands and a supporter of small communities, I believe this proposal is an all around negative to the state of Alaska. Unit 16 shares a border with Lake Clark, one of the last pristine brown bear habitats left on Earth. A haphazard approach to predator population control in favor of ungulates is not conservation, especially as the bears are under threat from the Johnson Tract Mine and declining salmon runs. This ecosystem is vital not only to local communities, but to us as citizens of this beautiful planet.

---



PC1400

**Name:** Cindy Rumpca

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

75

---



PC1401

**Name:** Marta Runnels

**Community of Residence:** Cincinnati OH

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 and its destruction of wildlife!

---



PC1402

**Name:** Rose Rush

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Oppose

We scream we are pro-life and here we are proposing the killing innocent animals when population control isn't necessary. This is between two National Parks which just contradicts the whole point of it being a preservation for animals. To use a sniper strategy is extremely gross. Hunting is one thing in a natural way (no technology), but to fly a helicopter and look down and shoot isn't even a fair playing field for these animals. This is their land.

---



PC1403

**Name:** Tea Rush

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Prop 75 is animal abuse and cruelty and needs to be stopped

---



PC1404

**Name:** Julieana Rusnak

**Community of Residence:** Santa Cruz

**Comment:**

My name is Julieana Rusnak, I oppose proposition 75. ADFG and University of Alaska Fairbanks biologists found no increase in moose harvests in the years following nearly 40 years of predator control in Southcentral Alaska. There is not enough research or evidence that this measure would not end up causing damage to the overall ecosystem by altering the food chain. This measure would also be costly and could negatively affect tourism in the area.

---



PC1405

**Name:** Melissa Russell-Payne

**Community of Residence:** Delaware

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 would have devastating impacts to wildlife that calls the land their home. The proposal is extreme and callous.

---



PC1406

**Name:** Kyle Rutledge

**Community of Residence:** Illinois

**Comment:**

Opposed to to proposal 75.

---



PC1407

**Name:** Scott Ryan

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I'm writing to oppose proposal 75. This proposal is barbaric and out of date with modern views on animal welfare.

These animals should not be gunned down and killed in numbers for this or any reason. Humans must agree to live amongst wildlife or not amongst them. It's an easy choice.

Thank you,

Scott Ryan

---



PC1408

**Name:** May Ryan

**Community of Residence:** Berryville, VA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

We need to protect our natural predators. They are necessary for biodiversity and the natural balance. We need to protect all animals, wolves and bears included. Not to mention that it is completely unethical to gun them down with helicopters. That is insuring they spend the last minutes or hours of their lives terrified which is horrible to do that to innocent animals.

---



PC1409

**Name:** Amanda Ryken

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75. Alaska is renowned for its wildlife, specifically bears and wolves and the thought that you would allow greedy, violent hungry people to hunt them down like this is appalling. Alaska is one of the last wild places on this planet that people come to see from all over the world. Communities rely on this tourism. By killing our native wildlife you are doing the state and communities more harm. I strongly oppose prop 75. Please save our wildlife. We are nothing without them.

---



PC1410

**Name:** Eni S

**Community of Residence:** Mexico

**Comment:**

With climate change, we need to protect all wildlife now more than ever, not be actively reducing their populations with guns and contributing to genetic bottlenecks. Bears are an integral part of the northamerican ecosystems, where humans and other animals live or go visit. Thus I oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1411

**Name:** Zanubia S

**Community of Residence:** Denver

**Comment:**

I do not support prop 75 nor the reduction of bear populations.

---



PC1412

**Name:** E. S.

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

Unit 16, Proposal 75

E.S., OPPOSE

REDUCE HUMAN HARVEST FIRST AND FOREMOST before interfering with the natural population balance of predator and prey.

"This leads us to focus on one of the few things that we can change: a concerted effort to improve caribou survival, especially cow survival, by reducing human harvest. If hunters and biologists can work together to track and reduce the harvest, the chances of a population rebound may increase."

---



PC1413

**Name:** Robert Sabin

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

Number 75

A barbaric cruel inhumane practice.

---



PC1414

**Name:** Shaun Sackett

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

I'm writing you and pleading with you and your organization and officials to not pass proposition 75! Please do let let Unit 16 be a killing field! What has happened to logic and common sense? We need to live and coexist with our wildlife and not destroy it for the selfish greed of the minority! I implore with you to reconsider and not pass this law. My family and future family depends on the future of our beautiful wildlife and not to destroy it!

---



PC1415

**Name:** Zach Sain

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is the biggest mistake the state could possibly make. Wolves are a keystone species and reducing their number by 75% will have a drastic impact on the health of that ecosystem. Not to mention that it's barbaric and inhumane. There is no need for this population reduction and to do so is simply wanton cruelty. Wolves should be protected and Alaska should be proud that we have such a robust population. Let them live!

---



PC1416

**Name:** Shermini Saini

**Community of Residence:** Missouri

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75!

---



PC1417

**Name:** Monica Salas

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Do better to manage wildlife. Are humans going to get killed when we become over populated too?

---



PC1418

**Name:** William Salaverry

**Community of Residence:** Sitka, Alaska

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75 to increase ADFG predator controls efforts by using aircraft to kill wolves, black bears, and brown bears. This will not be a reliable conservation strategy and will yield a boom and bust cycle in the highest trophic level, shocking the ecosystem out of balance. DO NOT DO THIS!

---



PC1419

**Name:** Parker Salazar

**Community of Residence:** Kissimmee, Florida

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 to remove wildlife is entirely unnecessary and a direct abhorrent slap in the face to the species survival plan that has been a righteous endeavor headed by passionate environmentalists and activists for decades. The proposal states that the Department of Wildlife and Game would stop shooting wolves if their numbers dropped to 35. 35 wolves in total as a goal should disgust any regular human with a conscience. We humans have desecrated our beautiful Earth and scar Mother Nature each passing year. This ceaseless slaughter of animals whose only sin is existing has been attempted in other national parks in recent years such as Yellowstone and have been successfully shut down. Humans should be learning from these animals as Teddy Roosevelt intended, to remove them from the only sanctuaries they have left is no better than what we did to Indigenous communities in the 1800's. We have so few wild animals on this planet left and Proposal 75 seeks to reduce that number even further for seemingly no reason other

than some group of hunters' sick addictions to superfluous murder in lieu of "subsistence living". The proposal was very short, I have a thought that the author was slobbering while writing it and couldn't muster much more of a coherent argument in favor of killing animals besides simply wanting to kill them. Thank you for your time, I only hope that you consider the point of no return we're reaching as a species on this planet. I wish for my daughter, Theodora to one day be able to see these animals through binoculars in a national park as Theodore Roosevelt dreamt of.

---



PC1420

**Name:** Diane Sallee

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose Proposal 75 which would allow ADFG to conduct aerial predator control in Game Unit 16. The wolves and bears in this area cross into Denali National Park, Denali National Preserve, Denali State Park, Lake Clark National Preserve, and Lake Clark National Park. All of these parks and frequented by non-hunting recreational users and wildlife photographers. Predator control programs can decimate packs of wolves and bear populations that millions of people come to see. Statistics compiled by the National Park Service and the U.S. Geological Survey show that Alaska's National parks units generated \$2.3 billion in economic value to Alaska in 2023 from 3.3 million visitors.

Alaska's predator control programs, which aim to increase moose, caribou, and deer populations for hunters, do not work. A 2022 study by ADFG and University of Alaska Fairbanks published in Diversity 2022, 14(11), 939; <https://doi.org/10.3390/d14110939> found no differences in mean moose harvests during periods of officially designated wolf control (2005-2020) and a previous period.

Wildlife populations in Alaska are being affected by climate change. Warming temperatures have hampered grazing, wildfires have burned forage, warmer winters have increased disease, and thawing permafrost has disrupted migrations. The tundra is changing, and predator control will not fix the problem.

---



PC1421

**Name:** Mara Pitari, Salviamo l'Orso

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: oppose

---



PC1422

**Name:** Mario Cipollone, Salviamo l'Orso (<https://www.salviamolorso.it/>)

**Community of Residence:** Italian

**Comment:**

Alaska is world wildlife heritage and proposal no. 75 is non-scientifically based and very likely it will end up in a useless slaughter of large carnivores that have no impact on caribou population, which have been dramatically reduced due to climatic changes in the last few decades and not to predation.

I strongly recommend the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to reconsider this proposal as it'll ruin the reputation of the State at the eyes of an international audience.

---



PC1423

**Name:** lewis sams

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. hunting from any vehicle is just so wrong.

---



PC1424

**Name:** Orna Samuelly

**Community of Residence:** Mercer island, WA

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. It is cruel and unethical. Leave the bears and wolves alone. Hunting them by helicopter is cruel. While i don't live in Alaska, i visit Alaska many times each year. I camp in katmai at Brooks camp and respect the wonders of the big beautiful Alaskan brown bears. They are a treasure and deserve our respect and support. I visit Juneau and dirks and fairbanks. You have such remarkable wildlife in Alaska. Please do not pass this unethical bill.

Thank you.

---



PC1425

**Name:** Diana Samuels

**Community of Residence:** Northern California USS

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I'm writing to ask you to not destroy the wolf and bear populations using aerial slaughter. All wildlife populations are self limiting and slaughtering wolfs has only been proven to prompt growth in numbers, not reduce. Bears do not reproduce quickly and you will be eradicating the species. Deer herds are also self regulating and if they are too low it is more likely due to environmental degradation by human influence. Let the indigenous tribes manage the situation as they understand the ties that bind wildlife to the land. Stop the aerial killing.



PC1426

**Name:** Silvia Sanasi

**Community of Residence:** Homer

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75

---



PC1427

**Name:** Veronica Sanchez

**Community of Residence:** Perris, CA

**Comment:**

I am against the proposal 75. Reduction of the 60% of brown bears is simply horrible, inhumane, cruel. These are the type of actions that have led our society to become so rotten.

---



PC1428

**Name:** Teresa Sandelin

**Community of Residence:** Palm coast Florida

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75!! Killing grizzly bears is inhumane. This serves no good purpose! Please do not pass this. They bring lots of tourists as well.

---



PC1429

**Name:** Stephanie Sanders

**Community of Residence:** Mn usa

**Comment:**

Oppose 75! This is ridiculous!! These are their homes and habitats, not ours!!! We must live WITH animals and nature in harmony or we will ALL suffer. This is disgraceful and disgustingly selfish of humans to negatively impact these animal communities. Shame on humans and shame on anyone who supports this. You are out of sync with life and its beauty. LEAVE THEM ALONE FFS.

---



PC1430

**Name:** Mackenzie Sanderson

**Community of Residence:** Lincoln County Oregon

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the proposed culling of wolves and grizzly bears from Alaska wilderness included in Proposal 75. While I am not a resident of Alaska, I grew up & currently reside in rural Oregon, and understand the delicate balance of predators and prey in the wild.

We have seen in many places over the years, the damage it has done when we lose a significant amount of a keystone species like wolves - the prey animals numbers typically rise to an unsustainable level and cause more problems.

For example, we've seen this off the coast of Oregon with the loss of our sea otters, rise in population of sea urchins, and significant loss of kelp forests.

It's a delicate balance to assist in maintaining equal numbers between predators and prey, but the proposed culling of this many animals is a poor judgement call in my opinion.

---



PC1431

**Name:** Matt Sandler

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

This is absurd. Gunning down wolves and bears when they are going extinct all over the world is a joke. What will the accomplish? More trophies on the big men in helicopters getting off shooting Mother bears and their cubs? Or mother wolves and their cubs? Imagine you are just minding your business roaming your natural habitat and someone comes flying by and guns you down for sport or pleasure or law when you haven't broke any laws. Seems respectable right? This is a joke. These bears and wolves have been brought to the brink of extinction all over the world and the numbers increasing is a great thing. We have enough space and if this is a safety issue then be responsible and protect your children from the wildlife with education not murder. I oppose 75 wholeheartedly.

---



PC1432

**Name:** Raquel Santo

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

75. Oppose. I strongly oppose the proposed bill to kill bears and wolves in an attempt to protect other species. This approach is not only irresponsible, but also cruel, and could have long-term, unintended consequences on the ecosystem.

Predators like bears and wolves play a vital role in maintaining ecological balance. Their presence helps regulate populations of other animals, ensuring biodiversity and healthy ecosystems. Instead of resorting to culling, we should focus on sustainable, humane solutions, such as supporting breeding programs for endangered species or creating protected habitats to facilitate their natural growth.

Intervening to “balance” populations by killing apex predators risks disrupting the delicate web of life and could ultimately harm the very species we aim to protect. Rather than viewing nature as something we can control at will, we should prioritize coexistence and restorative practices that respect the natural order.

---



PC1433

**Name:** Serena Santolamazza

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

I would like to express my opposition to the proposal #75

---



PC1434

**Name:** Alexandra Saunders

**Community of Residence:** Danville

**Comment:**

I oppose Prop 75. Culling does not work. It's antiquated and ignorant to manage wildlife this way

---



PC1435

**Name:** Anne Saunders

**Community of Residence:** Baja California

**Comment:**

No to proposal 75

I am a lover of Alaska, Denali Park and wildlife.

Do not allow ariel shooting of wildlife.

It is inhumane and destroys our wonderful wilderness creatures.

No on 75

---



PC1436

**Name:** Maxyne Schatten

**Community of Residence:** NJ

**Comment:**

Proposal 75,

You should gunning down native species in Alaska, wether gunning or poaching let them live

---



PC1437

**Name:** Diane Schenker

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am providing these comments in OPPOSITION to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (the "Department") Proposal 75 to amend 5 AAC 92.122. Intensive Management Plan VI to authorize the Department to "remove" or kill wolves, brown bears, and black bears in GMU 16. I am providing these comments in OPPOSITION to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (the "Department") Proposal 75 to amend 5 AAC 92.122. Intensive Management Plan VI to authorize the Department to "remove" or kill wolves, brown bears, and black bears in GMU 16. I am hunter/consumer of wildlife and a longtime resident of the State of Alaska; I am also a viewer and photographer of wildlife and do not want hunting to continue to be over-prioritized by the State of Alaska. Humans have plenty of options for diet and do not need to tamper with the natural balance of predators and prey to greedily allot all or too many prey animals for humans. Article VIII, Section 3 of the Alaska Constitution states that wildlife is reserved for the common use of the public. This includes both consumptive and nonconsumptive uses and requires the Board of Game to make decisions in the interests of all Alaskans, including current and future generations. The Board of Game has a public trust and fiduciary duty to conserve Alaska's wildlife and to manage Alaska's wildlife for the long term benefit of all Alaskans. This predator control operation will not work, is not in the interests of all Alaskans including future generations, and violates this Board's legal requirement articulated in provisions of the Alaska Constitution and case law construing those provisions to manage Alaska's wildlife for the benefit of all Alaskans and not just hunters and to conserve wildlife (particularly in these environmentally uncertain times).

GMU 16 is approximately 20,000 square miles yet, by the Department's own count, there are at most 150 to 180 wolves. This is .009 wolves per square mile. This small number of wolves is very unlikely to be having any significant impact on the number of moose in GMU 16. Instead, in a report issued by the Department, the primary predators of moose in GMU 16 have been residents of Anchorage and the Mat-Su Valley who come to hunt moose by airplane, high powered snow machines, or four wheelers using high-powered firearms: "several community members (from Skwentna) reported observations that some moose hunters participating in the Tier II winter hunt are also having a detrimental impact on moose in the area. These respondents said that some nonlocal hunters using powerful modern snowmachine technology are putting unprecedented levels of pressure on overwintering moose." "They run the moose down and exhaust them without even seeing if they have antlers until they are ready to kill them. The moose break their legs and pull muscles in deep snow and the young ones become really stressed. This happens over and over to the same moose in the same season and it definitely has an

impact on their health . . . They separate mothers from calves and do a lot of harm. Pregnant cows often abort their calves or have stillborns because of this stress.” Special Publication No. BOG 2019-03, “Overview of Use Patterns, Regulations, and Harvest History of Moose in Game Management Unit 16B.” This report, on page 7 and other pages, indicates that whenever the moose population increases after decreasing, this Board significantly increases the number of permits issued rather than balancing people’s desire to hunt with conservation of the moose population. Because this Board ignores conservation, and the increased hunting pressure on moose in GMU 16, several severe winters were enough to significantly decrease the number of moose. This has nothing to do with predation by wolves, brown bears, and black bears and everything to do with mismanagement and this Board’s authorization of overhunting when they should have been thinking of conservation given the historical increase and decrease of moose in GMU 16. This Board should have erred on the side of conservation to ensure the amount necessary for subsistence. However, now this Board is blaming its mismanagement of the moose population on a very small number of wolves, brown bears, and black bears.

Predator control of wolves, brown bears, and black bears does not work. The Department has allowed private citizens to kill wolves, brown bears, and black bears and has on its own killed wolves, brown bears, and black bears to increase prey populations but to no avail. Virtually every prey population in Alaska is declining precipitously except the Porcupine Caribou Herd. Even the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, which has been intensively managed against the recommendations of two of the Department’s own wildlife biologists, has not increased significantly after the slaughter of 180 brown bears, an unknown number of black bears, and over 50 wolves. The current estimated count of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd with the margin of error is the same as it was before implementation of the predator control operation. The only way to increase prey populations is by significantly limiting hunting including illegal hunting. Just because someone lives in Alaska, whether it be in a rural or urban area, does not guarantee their right or privilege to get a moose, sheep, or caribou every year. Particularly considering the recent environmental changes and bacterial diseases which are causing the declines of caribou, moose, sheep, and other populations all around the State of Alaska. This Department’s current management policies of wildlife are going to result in wildlife declining and eventually disappearing just as Chinook, Chum, and Coho salmon have under this Department’s misguided management decisions. Do you, the members of the Board of Game, all really want to be the people personally responsible for the decline and eventual extinction of the State of Alaska’s wildlife populations?

Predator control upends natural selection and selects for the genetically weaker members of a population. Wolves, bears, sheep, moose, wolverines, beavers, and many other animals are currently declining precipitously in the State of Alaska. These animals are all integral to the vast and varied ecosystems in the State of Alaska. When hunters kill animals, they generally target the genetically superior members of a population such as the oldest rams with the fullest curls who are strong enough to have survived many winters, the moose and caribou which are the largest with the biggest racks, the leaders of their herds, and have survived the longest, or the biggest wolves, wolverines, or beavers. Predators, on the other hand, prey on the older, weaker, sicker, and genetically inferior members of a population. Together, this upends natural selection, which naturally selects for the genetically superior members of a population, and instead selects for the genetically inferior members of a population. This is obvious to anyone who has studied genetics and read and studied Charles Darwin’s and Alfred Russel Wallace’s *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. This results in genetically inferior prey populations which are less able to adapt to environmental and biological challenges and escape legal and illegal hunters. As a result, we are witnessing the Board’s approval and the Department’s implementation of misguided predator control operations which have not significantly increased the overall abundance of prey populations. Predator

control may work in the very short term, but over the long term, predator control changes the genetics of a population to be inferior and less able to adapt and survive in the changing climate and with more prevalent biological diseases. Humans are foolish and arrogant to believe that they can step in and control nature. See <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2841644/>, <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6297&context=facpub>, and <https://www.vaia.com/en-us/textbooks/environmental-science/elements-of-ecology-8-edition/chapter-15/problem-10-how-can-prey-function-as-agents-of-natural-select/>.

In addition, if this Board approves Proposal 75 authorizing the Department to shoot 100 wolves so that only about 35 to 55 wolves remain in all of GMU 16, which is an area which encompasses and abuts Denali National Park and Preserve and Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, places where many people recreate and go to view wolves, brown bears, and black bears, this Board is only considering the interests of hunters and trappers and is not considering the interests of all Alaskans including future generations and nonconsumptive users of wildlife. Given the already extremely low number of wolves in the very vast GMU 16, this would violate several provisions of the Alaska Constitution including Article VIII, Sections 3 and 4. Rather than approving predator control in GMU 16, this Board should impose a hiatus on any hunting for five years, allow nature to control the outcome, and see what happens to the populations of moose during this period. In any event, conducting predator control of wolves so that there are only .00175 wolves per square mile violates the sustained yield and common use clauses of the Alaska Constitution.

Finally, I have been informed by an owner of a lodge in Denali National Park and Preserve that every wolf is worth \$1.3 million in tourist revenue per year. If this Board approves Proposal 75, then this Board is completely ignoring the tourist industry which financially benefits and employs a significant number of Alaskans.

Future generations of Alaskans should not be limited to only being able to view wolves trapped in zoo enclosures. Even though I have traveled to virtually every area of Alaska, I have only seen one wolf in the late 1990's while flying from King Salmon to Anchorage. This was one of the most impactful wildlife sightings of my entire life and I will never forget this memory of a large wolf on the tundra looking up as we flew by in our Turbine Beaver.

For all these reasons, the Board should vote to disapprove the Department's Proposal 75.

NOTE: I would like to add that your web page makes it confusing and difficult to submit comments on proposals. It is unhelpful that you provide instructions for faxing and appearing in person but do not provide a link to this comment form or have an email address for comments. It has the appearance of impropriety, as if you are purposely attempting to put obstacles in the way of the general public submitting comments. I found the comment form by googling and down a long list, finding some organization that provided a direct link to this form. It should have pointed me to your agency website for a direct link.

---



PC1438

**Name:** Elana Schlink

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Opposed to proposal 75. Bears and wolfs are beautiful creatures. They do not deserve to be killed.

---



PC1439

**Name:** Sandefur Schmidt

**Community of Residence:** Provo, Utah

**Comment:**

I am AGAINST Proposal 75. How can you even possibly consider killing THAT MANY bears in a national park?!?!?!? Apart from the ineptness of the proposal, you are shooting yourselves in the foot, leg and arm by destroying such a valuable part of Alaska. And gunning them down from helicopters?? That is just plain cruel. This is one of the last places we can go to experience all the wildlife in such a beautiful area. And all of our visits are pretty darned important to your economy. I have traveled to the Clark National Forest twice in the last three years just to photograph bears. I doubt I would return again if you follow through with this egregious proposal.

---



PC1440

**Name:** Jessica Schmit

**Community of Residence:** Livingston

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. There are more beneficial ways to manage predator populations, such as increasing the number of hunting tags, as opposed to aerially shooting these creatures.

---



PC1441

**Name:** Jacob Schmit

**Community of Residence:** Oklahoma

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 because it will cause more harm than good to the environment

---



PC1442

**Name:** Stefanie Schober

**Community of Residence:** Cedar Park, Texas

**Comment:**

I am voicing my concern AGAINST proposal number 75. Studies have shown that these indiscriminate predator control programs do NOT achieve the intended outcome of boosting human moose harvest. A reversion to outdated management concepts without effective monitoring to scientifically support the actions taken cannot be supported.

---



PC1443

**Name:** Anna Schouten

**Community of Residence:** Sweden

**Comment:**

I comment on 75.

I want animals to be free and do as they please. Just as humans, I believe they have souls. Shooting animals, is like shooting people to mee. Making war. That's why I oppose.

---



PC1444

**Name:** Tina Schreiner

**Community of Residence:** Auburn, Kansas

**Comment:**

I Oppose Proposition 75. It takes no account of the genetics of the animals that will be killed. Instead, the proposition just calls for unscientific, Rambo-type culling of defenseless creatures. Which, in turn, will upset the gorgeous ecosystem of the Alaska ecosystem. I OPPOSE PROPOSITION 75.

---



PC1445

**Name:** Kristi Schuft

**Community of Residence:** South Dakota

**Comment:**

Prop 75. NO!

---



PC1446

**Name:** Denise Schuld

**Community of Residence:** Nassau county NY

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. There has to be another option than this inhumane one.

---



PC1447

**Name:** Nina Schuyler

**Community of Residence:** San Francisco

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 to shoot the bears, reducing the population by 60%. I oppose the shooting of any bears. They have a right to live in their habitat. We need to stop putting humans first and make room on this planet for other beings. What will be left for the future generations if we continue with human exceptionalism?

---



PC1448

**Name:** Milagros Scott

**Community of Residence:** Matinuska Susitna Borough

**Comment:**

75- Gov has tried to control wolf population before in Yellowstone. That was disasterous. The government should never interfere with a keystone species again, you'll only recreate the worst ripple effect of all time in our own ecosystem.

---



December 27th, 2024

To: The Alaska Board of Game  
Subject: Opposition to Proposal 75

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

We, the undersigned individuals and organizations, respectfully submit this letter in strong **opposition to Proposal 75**, which seeks to add Department removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears to the Unit 16 Intensive Management Plan. This proposal includes authority for public aerial shooting permits, public land-and-shoot permits, and allowing Department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters.

This proposal, in its current form, threatens to undermine long-standing principles of conservation, biodiversity, and public involvement in wildlife management.

We are concerned that this proposal may lead to the following negative consequences:

**Threat to Wildlife Populations:** The State seeks to reduce wolf populations in Unit 16 by 70%-80%, with a goal of killing “at least 113 wolves” for a target population of 35-55 wolves. The Department claims not to have plans for aerial bear control at this time, but their addition of bears to this proposal leads us to believe that the State does –if not currently– have future intentions to aerially kill black and brown bears. Why else would the State request authority to aerially gun wolves *and* bears if they only intended a Department-led cull of wolves? Per previous bear control goals for Unit 16, we can surmise that the Department maintains their goal of reducing brown bear populations by 60% and black bear populations by 60-80% in Unit 16.

It is our understanding that the most recent abundance estimates for black and brown bears were performed in 2007. For wolves, the last fall abundance estimate was conducted in 2003, and was based on a wolf study conducted in 1999. We fear that the Department is building predator control programs off of outdated data, without the commitment to study pre, during, and post control conditions. Therefore, the department risks its professional credibility by killing bears and wolves when it has inadequate data on predator population numbers and no ability to estimate the magnitude of the effect of killing predators on moose or predator populations.

**Undermining of Local Communities and Industries:** To our knowledge, the Department did not consult with any of the villages in the proposed control area, nor did the State make any effort



to consult with operators in Unit 16 engaged in wildlife viewing industries. For a control program of this size, with such high anticipated costs, we expect the State to engage with affected communities, including those in the control area and neighboring it, which include portions of the Anchorage bowl.

**Public Involvement and Transparency:** We feel the Department is not acting in good faith or transparency by adding bears to this proposal while not clearly defining what ADF&G's goal or plans for bear removal are. If this proposal passes, ADF&G could create a bear removal plan without public input on bear removal goals, the length of a Department-sponsored cull, or on the methods ADF&G would employ to measure the impact of predator removal on predator and prey populations. This violates public trust; any state-sponsored predator program of this magnitude should be thoroughly vetted by the public, with the opportunity to comment on specific plans, not implemented by blanket Department authority.

**Negative Economic Impact:** Wildlife tourism, particularly in the Denali and Cook Inlet regions, has enormous economic and cultural value on living bears in Unit 16. In the Cook Inlet region, our businesses earn **over \$9.5 million in wildlife viewing revenue each year**. We accommodate **over 7,500 guests** seeking to view wildlife in the Cook Inlet and southern Denali region each year.

- According to [a study](#) by the University of Alaska Fairbanks, bear tourism in Southcentral Alaska generated \$34.5 million in 2017 and contributed \$10 million in direct wages and benefits to the region, supporting 680 jobs. The study focused on four areas: Katmai National Park & Preserve, McNeil River State Game Sanctuary, Lake Clark National Park & Preserve, and the Cook Inlet Region. These areas attract thousands of visitors to witness the bears fishing for salmon, playing with their cubs and interacting with each other. The study estimated that each bear in Southcentral Alaska is worth \$1.3 million over its lifetime, based on the tourism revenue it generates.
- In 2015, Denali National Park [released a report](#) that shows that the over 530,000 visitors who came to Denali National Park and Preserve in 2014 spent \$5.24 million in communities near the park. That spending supported almost 7,000 jobs in the local area, which includes the 300+ employees of the park's largest concessioner, and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$7.48 million. Wildlife viewing is the driving force behind tourism in both Lake Clark and Denali National Park and Preserves, bringing economic benefits to the surrounding communities.

We believe that aerial gunning programs on wolves and/or bears in Unit 16 would have 3 extremely negative impacts on wildlife and our livelihoods. These programs not only jeopardize the survival of bears and wolves in two of the most popular wildlife viewing areas in the world,



but would also damage the reputation of Alaska as a state that values naturally functioning ecosystems, including those with large predators.

As concerned Alaskans, conservationists, and citizens who value our state's natural heritage, we urge the Alaska Board of Game to oppose this proposal. We advocate for the protection of Alaska's wildlife, the preservation of healthy ecosystems, and the support of communities whose livelihoods depend on sustainable management practices.

We urge the Board to base decisions on thorough scientific research and ensure that public input remains a cornerstone of the decision-making process. We believe that the proposed changes outlined in Proposal 75 represent a harmful step backward and, therefore, strongly request its rejection.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Sincerely,

Heather Wells - *Scott Company Publishing Travel Guide Books*

Scott Graber - *Travel Guide Magazine*

McKenzie Daigle- *Natural Habitat Adventures*

Juliette Boselli- *Denali Mountain Works*

Stephen Stringham- *WildWatch*

Ron Levy- *Alaska Photo Adventures*

Haley Johnson- *Tundra Travels*

Katherine Ottmers- *Denaliguides.co*

Bethany Boyd- *Denali Photo Guides*

David Bachrach- *AK Adventures, Inc.*

Emily Atwood- *Emily Atwood Photography*

David Coray- *Silver Salmon Creek Lodge*

Erica Hausfel-, *Curious Nature Guided Adventures, LLC*

Craig Coray - *Self*



PC1450

**Name:** Heather Scranton

**Community of Residence:** Salt Lake City, Utah

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 calling for the slaughter of 40% of the brown bear population in unit 16. Aside from feeling this is a cruel and immoral approach, I have wanted to visit Alaska for the sake of viewing abundant wildlife. Alaska should be proud to house these beautiful animals and they should be treated with reverence and respect.

---



PC1451

**Name:** Allie Scrivner

**Community of Residence:** Alabama

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75. I strongly believe that both bears, and wolves, along with other apex predators, still need to be protected! They are being hunted down illegally, and if the law makers keep making it legal to hunt them down, sooner or later it will be too late to save them.

---



PC1452

**Name:** Camille Sematiski

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

I am against proposal 75!

Indeed reading the proposal sounds like a way to murder wolves and bears “for fun” from an helicopter. I would also like to understand how reducing the population of wolves by 50% would be beneficial to the ecosystem..

---



PC1453

**Name:** Janie Semprevivo

**Community of Residence:** West New York, NJ

**Comment:**

Oppose Prop. 75. With only 200,000 brown bears alive worldwide and 32500 in the U.S, why would the state of AK, consider the barbaric practice of aerial killing. Your state is a pristine and vast wilderness with enough room for all. The wolf population in the US has decreased by 70% due to overheating. The Mexican red wolf will soon suffer extinction. All wolves deserve protection. People travel to your state

for peace, tranquility and to immerse themselves in the wildlife. Please do not needlessly kill these animals when there is no economic need. I ask you to oppose prop bill 75!!!

---



PC1454

**Name:** Mara Sesink

**Community of Residence:** London, Ontario

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - OPPOSE

WE DO NOT DETERMINE WILDLIFE POPULATIONS JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE THE MEANS TO “REGULATE”. It is not our authority to kill off wildlife just because a certain group of humans deem them unnecessary. Bears and wolves are the most important species in helping keep our western ecosystems thriving and taking that away could make a detrimental impact. Ask yourselves, what is the purpose of this? Why is this necessary? I can guarantee any answer you have to these questions contradict common sense and humane responses.

---



PC1455

**Name:** Yvonne Settle

**Community of Residence:** Elkton Maryland

**Comment:**

“Inhumane and Unethical Methods: Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

Threat to Ecosystem Balance: Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

Lack of Transparency and Oversight: Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

Conservation and Economic Risks: Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska’s wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities.”

---



PC1456

**Name:** Valerie Sewell

**Community of Residence:** Vero Beach, Florida

**Comment:**

Proposal #75

This is not conservation!! This is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is irresponsible wildlife management of species and in a place that deserve so much more care. It is cruel.

---



PC1457

**Name:** Mary Shabbott

**Community of Residence:** Arkansas

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: I absolute oppose this horrid plan to shoot down wolves and other keystone species. I am an avid wildlife advocate and travel to SEE LIVING wildlife. I am sickened that you are considering a mass slaughter of animals to appease special interests. I will not be going back to Alaska to spend my tourist dollars if this passes.

---



PC1458

**Name:** Elizabeth Shafer

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

#75 - please leave the bears and wolves alone around lake Clark. Culling only makes the populations out of balance. Nature has its own balance control. One of the things that makes Alaska so great is its wildlife.

---



PC1459

**Name:** Elizabeth Sharkie

**Community of Residence:** UK

**Comment:**

Proposal #75

I am writing to oppose the above proposal of aerial shooting of bears and wolves in an area which borders National Parks. Alaska is one of the few remaining areas in the world which has unspoilt beauty and is a haven for wildlife and biodiversity. Apart from the risk of unbalancing this fragile ecosystem, the use of helicopters/small airplanes is not in line with environmental safeguards, hence I strongly oppose this particular proposal.

---



PC1460

**Name:** Nathan Sharp

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. Absolutely the wrong thing to do.

---



PC1461

**Name:** Sylvia Sharp

**Community of Residence:** Miami

**Comment:**

Please protect them do not kill them proposal 75

---



PC1462

**Name:** Leslie Shatkin

**Community of Residence:** Buffalo New York

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. It is an unwise decision to kill such a large population of bears. There are other ways you can save Caribou and other species. Perhaps look to over grazing. Don't make this hasty terrible agonizing decision. Don't kill families of bears. Thank you, and please save them.

---



PC1463

**Name:** Linda Shaw

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose Proposal 75 that would allow a number of methods by state employees, including aerial gunning from helicopters to kill wolves, black and brown bears in Unit 16, which borders Denali and Lake Clark National Parks. As an Alaskan and photographer and have and intend to continue to visit these areas for wildlife photography of wolves and bears. Reducing these populations by 60 - 80% IS UNACCEPTABLE for so many reasons. These reasons include destabilizing ecosystem integrity, unethical and cruel removal methods, compromising of National Parks that belong to all Americans, wasteful government spending and overreach, ignoring of the interests of Alaskans who want to see these areas remain ecologically intact, ignoring the interests of non-consumptive uses and generators of economic activity, including the tourism industry. I urge you to deny this proposal, represent all Alaskans and maintain the integrity of Alaska's wild heritage. As a proud supporter of the grass roots Alaska Wildlife Alliance I look forward to tracking your actions on this issue. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---



PC1464

**Name:** Deborah Shaw Booth

**Community of Residence:** Santa Barbara, California

**Comment:**

As a botanist and wildlife enthusiast my entire life, I strongly oppose proposition 75 predator control targeting brown bears and wolves. These programs have repeatedly failed to produce the intended result of boosting Caribou and Moose populations. Instead, the misguided program of predator control destroys the ecosystem which includes fish, plants and other species, and ultimately, the moose and caribou. Gunning down Alaskan brown bears, and wolves is misguided and archaic. Please modernize your policies and look to the science of ecosystem biology. I strongly oppose proposition 75.

---



PC1465

**Name:** H Sherwood

**Community of Residence:** Shawnigan Lake

**Comment:**

I do not support proposal 75.

---



PC1466

**Name:** Hetal Sheth

**Community of Residence:** North Carolina

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 OPPOSE

Bears are considered a keystone species because they play a vital role in maintaining a healthy ecosystem. Here are some ways bears contribute to the ecosystem:

**Predator-prey balance:** Bears are apex predators that help regulate the populations of smaller predators and herbivores. This helps maintain a balanced ecosystem.

**Seed dispersal:** Bears spread seeds through their droppings, which helps plants grow.

**Nitrogen release:** Bears eat salmon, which releases nitrogen into the soil through their carcasses. This nitrogen helps plants grow.

**Insect control:** Bears root through logs to control insect populations.

**Decomposition:** Bears scavenge carcasses, which helps with decomposition.

**Landscape mosaic:** Bears maintain a landscape mosaic of processes, which reduces the risk of ecosystem collapse.

**Nutrient retention:** Bears keep carbon, nitrogen, and other nutrients within the food chain.

Bears are ecosystem engineers, meaning they can significantly modify their environment. Without bears, the ecosystem would be threatened or may even cease to exist.

---



PC1467

**Name:** Parth Shiras

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence.

Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches.

---



PC1468

**Name:** Kim Shraibati

**Community of Residence:** Austin texas

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75. I have been to Alaska and the wildlife and wilderness is stunning. It is something to be proud of and protected. Bears are a keystone species. Leave them be.

---



PC1469

**Name:** Julian Shull

**Community of Residence:** Lehi Utah

**Comment:**

We are facing a dark future for the native wildlife of this beautiful country, and Alaska remains one of the last truly wild places. Gunning down wolves and bears from the skies like they are vermin is not only unethical and inhumane, it puts Alaska's ecosystem at risk and disregards the sanctity of life, destroying the delicate balance of Alaska's natural environment and ecosystem. Please for the sake of the wild, oppose prop 75.

---



PC1470

**Name:** allyson sibole

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is disgraceful and inhumane. People come to Alaska to see the wildlife and to conserve it. Why would you want to kill the residents that were here first?

---



PC1471

**Name:** Em Sievers

**Community of Residence:** Eastsound

**Comment:**

Oppose Proposition 75.

---



PC1472

**Name:** Magdalena Sikora

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

Hello, I am writing to voice my deep opposition to Proposal 75. I understand the need to increase moose and caribou populations and believe that to be very important; however, killing other predators at large, will not change these populations, as research has demonstrated. Moreover, we will be traumatizing wolf packs and bear families, severely affecting the wellbeing of the surviving animals; and not to mention, the potential of accidents from aerial gunning. What's more, the effects of a changing climate on the viability and size of moose and caribou populations, a major threat to the health of these populations, are not addressed in this proposal.

American conservation history has shown over decades and centuries that targeting of predators has unintended consequences to the land and health of ecosystems. Mass killing is not only inhumane, it also has been shown to be ineffective at increasing moose populations. I beg you to please speak with wildlife biologists well-versed in these matters to find creative, non-lethal methods for improving moose and caribou populations. Biologists like Stephen Miller and William Ripple who have published on the matter. Moreover, expanding protected areas for animals to live and thrive is a more basic potential action you could take to preserve and expand moose populations. Decades of conservation biology has shown us that the less humans manipulate wildlife and the more it protects wildlife, the stronger and healthier are ecosystems and species populations.

Please, oppose Proposal 75. At a time of climate and extinction crises, when land untouched by human hand and development is shrinking to tiny slivers, we must do better to ensure diverse wildlife is thriving; mass killings from aerial gunning is unacceptable. I write earnestly and hopefully that you will give wolves and bears a chance to live out their lives in peace and work to assist moose populations in non-lethal ways.

Thank you very much for your time.

Magdalena Sikora

---



PC1473

**Name:** Amanda Sili

**Community of Residence:** Willoughby, OH, 44094

**Comment:**

I fully and adamantly Oppose proposal 75. This proposal is an dangerous and down right detrimental to the environment and ecosystem. This proposal will do more harm to the surrounding area's that good, as it will have serious and severe impacts in the region for decades to come. I believe this proposal should NOT be passed.

---



PC1474

**Name:** Maureen Sinclair

**Community of Residence:** Virginia

**Comment:**

Oppose proposition #75.

---



PC1475

**Name:** Maurice Sinclair

**Community of Residence:** Nashville, TN

**Comment:**

I wholeheartedly oppose the killing of the bears and wolves in Alaska under proposal 75.

---



PC1476

**Name:** Theresa Siskind

**Community of Residence:** St Petersburg

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75, the areil shooting of Wolves and Bears.

Hunters should NOT have more influence on policy. Most Americans support rigorous protections of Wolves and Bears in Alaska (and elsewear).

---



**Name:** Rosemarie Skillman

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which would allow the aerial gunning of wolves and bears in Unit 16, for the following reasons:

**Ineffective Wildlife Management**

Decades of predator control in Alaska have failed to increase moose harvests, as shown by ADFG's own research. Killing predators without clear evidence of success wastes resources and doesn't solve the problem.

**Harm to Alaska's Reputation**

This program would take place near world-famous parks like Denali and Lake Clark, damaging Alaska's image as a leader in wildlife conservation and tourism.

**High Costs with No Benefit**

Past predator control programs have cost millions of dollars without results. At a time when budgets are tight, this proposal is an irresponsible use of funds.

**Disrupting the Ecosystem**

Killing predators on such a large scale harms the balance of the ecosystem and is not supported by proper scientific monitoring.

**Public Opposition**

Aerial gunning is unpopular and raises ethical concerns. Approving this plan would erode trust in the Board of Game's decision-making.

**Conclusion**

Proposal 75 is costly, ineffective, and harmful to Alaska's wildlife and reputation. I urge the Board of Game to reject it and focus on sustainable, science-based wildlife management.



**Name:** Dylan Skirko

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75. I work in the tourism industry and reducing these animals would hurt the tourism industry, we take people to see these animals. Protecting these animals and supporting one of Alaskas biggest industries is most important. It's already rare to see wolves, even in protected areas. I know this because I personally go out with tourists every day in the summer and look for all of the animals described in the proposal.

---



PC1479

**Name:** Joseph Skrha

**Community of Residence:** Kenai, Alaska

**Comment:**

I am writing to vehemently oppose Proposal 75, the wholesale killing go wolves. I oppose this proposal because some of us Alaskans (eat. 80% of populations) choose to see a wolf in the wild and believe we have as much right to see wolves as hunters have a right to kill a moose. I choose to hunt with a camera and that right will be deprived should ADFG get permission to implement the Wholesale slaughter of wolves under proposal 75. Wolves are a family unit and killing them disrupts their social structure. I spent 12 days in Denali National Park and due to the liberal hunting practices permitted by the Board of Game, I never saw a wolf the whole time I was there. I spent over 1

\$10,000.00 in hopes of photographing wolves but there were none seen for long periods of time. This proposal will wipe out wolves on the southern boundary of Denali National Park all the way to Cook Inlet. If bears are included in this slaughter, the brown bear I study at Silver Salmon Beach that freed on clams, not moose, will be devastated also. Face it, there is a group of hunters that hunt moose but there is many more tourists, photographers or families that come to Alaska to see Brown Bears and Wolves. You will jeopardize their rights to explore and see these animals solely to provide a few more moose for hunters. This is WRONG. Please do not support Proposal 75.

---



PC1480

**Name:** Isabella Smedley

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75, In a world that is dominated by humans and shrinking for wildlife, you have a unique opportunity to to be the center of protection for them Let your legacy be one that has protected the most vulnerable and not destroyed them.

---



PC1481

**Name:** Madison Smiley

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE proposal 75, which calls for the mass reduction of wolf and bear populations in Alaska bordering its state parks. I see no value in this action. Removing these key predator species in such large numbers will cause irreparable damage to the ecosystems they are a part of. This will cause unimaginable damage to Alaska's wildlife, as well as its tourist trade that relies so heavily on that wildlife. There is no reason to kill these animals. They are not infringing on human life in the middle of their native, wild homes. This proposal is barbaric and inhumane.

---



PC1482

**Name:** Lindsay Smith

**Community of Residence:** Wasila

**Comment:**

I vehemently oppose proposal 75

---



PC1483

**Name:** C Smith

**Community of Residence:** New Jersey

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is a ludicrous and outrageous proposal. There is no good reason to clear brown bears or any other wildlife from this area, and to suggest that it's necessary is not just harmful, it's eco fascism. Literally the LAST thing we need in this day and age. The Alaskan ecosystem is one of the only truly untouched areas of wilderness in the USA; let's keep it that way. Oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1484

**Name:** Luke Smith

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75. This is a ridiculous proposal and will hurt the ecosystem and economy and provides zero benefit in any way.

---



PC1485

**Name:** Lynne Smith

**Community of Residence:** Alabama

**Comment:**

I am writing to protest Proposal 75.

The proposal to use aerial assault to massacre the bears and other wildlife in Area 16 is heartless, careless, dangerous and just plain evil. I do not live in Alaska, but I have vacationed there. The opportunity to see the incredible wildlife was the main factor that drew us to visit Alaska. It's the last wild, free and unspoiled habitat in the US. Your proposal would destroy that habitat.

It is inhumane to go to war against the wildlife that are just trying to live in their home as God made them to do. It goes against all that Alaska has represented since statehood-the last true, wild frontier in the

US. A place of untold, unspoiled beauty and incredible wildlife, where citizens can come to observe bears, wolves, foxes and the realm of nature in its truest, most pure form.

It is repulsive that you would seek to basically destroy that ecosystem. You can kiss tourism dollars goodbye if you slaughter the animals. It's morally wrong; it's barbaric; it's stupid; it's heartless; it is reprehensible; and any human being who would carry out such a plan is completely soul-less and without compassion. It will also wreak havoc on the ecosystem.

Please leave the animals alone. They may be easy pickings for men with assault weapons firing down from safety of helicopters at innocent animals, and that makes this proposal all the more evil. Please do the right thing and abandon this horrible proposal 75.

Thank you very much.

---



PC1486

**Name:** Christine Smith

**Community of Residence:** Bellingham Wa

**Comment:**

I do not support proposal 75. The removal of bears and wolves via helicopter is immoral. Also, this is not real conservation.

While I live in Washington state, I spend my summers in Alaska and recognize what brings tourists to Alaska is the wildlife.

The last cull took 90'-some animal lives that was not based in science. It was indiscriminate killing. The Board can and must do better science backed management.

---



PC1487

**Name:** Taylor Smith

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75. Increase hunting opportunities instead of murdering the animals from the sky.

---



PC1488

**Name:** Lynn Smith

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75

5 AAC 92.111. Control of predation by wolves.

5 AAC 92.115. Control of predation by bears.

OPPOSE this proposal and the suggested methodology for raising ungulate populations. There has been no scientific evidence to back up the culling of keystone species as beneficial to predator-prey populations and overall ecological balance.

In fact, elimination of keystone species has detrimental effects on the health of the ecosystem: reduced biodiversity, growth of invasive species, reverberating effects on the food web, top-down trophic cascade similar to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem when wolves were eradicated.

This is a short-sighted and uninformed proposal that has long-reaching and long-lasting consequences. Instead, the Alaskan ADFG should focus on the impacts of deforestation, habitat destruction, human encroachment, and setting stricter quotas on hunting of ungulate populations. Hunting is a significant cause of adult moose mortality, as well as nutritional stress due to disease and habitat loss. The declining moose population is a response to human-caused and human-preventable issues.

In essence: calf survival depends on healthy herds and adult survival; population increase depends on healthy adults. Adults are dying early due to the aforementioned habitat destruction and hunting of adults. There is no evidence supporting that the current population of predators is directly causing the decline in ungulate populations.

---



PC1489

**Name:** Donna Smith

**Community of Residence:** Eagle Rock

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the killing of bears and wolves in proposition #75

---



PC1490

**Name:** Sarah Smith

**Community of Residence:** Orange County

**Comment:**

I am opposing prop 75. Historically culling is a terrible way to control populations.

---



PC1491

**Name:** Luke Smith

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75 very strongly. This cannot be allowed to pass.

---



PC1492

**Name:** Jason Smith

**Community of Residence:** Ewa

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in this beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists. National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence. Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---



PC1493

**Name:** Bailey Smith

**Community of Residence:** Kotlik, Alaska

**Comment:**

Commenting on Proposal 75 - strongly oppose. This proposal makes no attempt to allow for methods that would be stable for the ecosystem but instead supports an idea that would cause drastic changes.

---



PC1494

**Name:** Hope Snead

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I am opposing Proposition 75 as I believe there are other measures that could be taken to raise prey population rather than just killing wolves and bears outright. Predators play an important role in our ecosystem. While getting rid of predators would cause the numbers to rise, it also allows over population of prey animals for years to come. Killing off mass amounts of wolves and bears will affect their ecosystems for decades. Surely there are ways to solve your low-prey issue without killing these animals. Relocation efforts have proven successful in Yellowstone, and Colorado is beginning its journey into working WITH wolves. I truly believe that if this proposition passes you will face issues that reach far into your children's and grandchildren's lives.

---



PC1495

**Name:** Laura Sneddon

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I'm writing to oppose/support a few proposals...

1st is to express my opposition of Proposal 75.

Allowing ADFG staff to use aerial gunning of predators in an area that borders Denali National Park, Denali National Preserve, Denali State Park, Lake Clark National Preserve, and Lake Clark National Park, could disrupt the natural ecosystem and negatively impact wildlife populations that attract visitors to these parks.

Additionally, there are ongoing predator control programs in adjacent Units 13 and 17. Introducing a similar program in Unit 16 could result in over 600 miles of land across the state being managed to reduce or remove predators, disrupting the long-term ecological balance in these regions.

Given these considerations, it is important to carefully evaluate the potential ecological and recreational impacts before proceeding with such measures. Please oppose Proposal 75 so unsafe practices are not put forth in motion.

2nd is to express my support for Proposal 82.

This proposal would establish a 50-yard trapping setback along specific trails in the area, which are ones that are heavily used for recreational purposes. These trapping setbacks would help keep dogs and people safe from incidental trapping.

Please support proposal 82 to keep people and canines safe!!

3rd is to express my support for Proposal 11.

Proposal 11 would shorten the spring and fall brown bear seasons in Unit 9C by one week, back to its previous length. If this proposal were to pass, user conflicts would decrease and public safety would improve.

Vote yes on Proposal 11 to keep people safe!

4th and last, is my support of Proposal 29.

By having a review of the population and harvest objectives for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd would provide data as to what appropriate harvesting targets are given latest heard numbers.

This should hopefully shed light on the fact that there is no need to increase the quota on MCH predator control. Keep in mind that predators are only a sliver of risk to the MCH as compared to climate change's toil to the MCH's lichen diet.

Support Proposal 29 to keep numbers in line with current MCH population data.

---



**Name:** Megan Snyder

**Community of Residence:** Seattle, WA

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE Proposal 75.

Studies have shown that Alaska's predator control programs — aimed at boosting moose, caribou, and deer populations for hunters — DO NOT increase human moose harvest.

Large carnivore management in Alaska is a reversion to outdated management concepts and occurs without effective monitoring programs designed to scientifically evaluate impacts on predator populations or identify causal relationships between predator control and pre-population dynamics.

I DO NOT support any proposal or action that would give ADFG the authority to develop an Operational Plan for aerial gunning that is not open to public comment.

---



PC1497

**Name:** Christiana Soccini

**Community of Residence:** Italia

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose purpose #75. It is incomprehensible and unacceptable that such a forward-thinking country maintains such antiquated positions in respecting the rights of other animals. Totemic animals like bears should be carried in the palm of one's hand. If the possibility of killing them passes, I will not do tourism in Alaska and I will work hard to get everyone to boycott this sector of the local economy.

---



PC1498

**Name:** Lauren Solmes

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

75) bad idea, bears need protection

---



PC1499

**Name:** Cara Somerville

**Community of Residence:** Killeen, Texas

**Comment:**

Opposing proposal 75. Allowing open fire against innocent brown bears is outrageous. They deserve to be there. Please reconsider.

---



PC1500

**Name:** Hannah Sonnen

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Comment:**

Proposal 75- oppose.

This is not the next step in reducing population growth. This is not conservation.

Increase amount of tags, provide incentive for tags, whether that be lowering the cost or increasing awareness of the availability. This would increase economic benefits and drive in revenue for the department to fund more conservation efforts. Why are you taking this approach when others have not yet been researched or tested? Proposal 75 is not sustainable.

We are not the deciders of the land, therefore we should not be enacting genocide of animals across the land.

Do better.

---



PC1501

**Name:** Stephanie Southard

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and

Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical concerns but also disrupts the natural balance within ecosystems. Reducing predator populations can have cascading effects on prey species and may lead to overpopulation and habitat degradation, ultimately harming the very wildlife we seek to protect.

Instead of resorting to extreme measures like aerial gunning, we should focus on promoting responsible wildlife management practices that emphasize conservation, habitat protection, and coexistence.

Engaging the public through educational programs and sustainable tourism initiatives can foster greater appreciation for our wildlife and encourage stewardship.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider Proposal 75 and explore alternative approaches that uphold Alaska's reputation as a leader in wildlife conservation and sustainable tourism. Let us work together to protect our natural heritage and ensure that future generations can enjoy the wonders of Alaska's wildlife.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



PC1502

**Name:** Lucas Spaulding

**Community of Residence:** Idaho

**Comment:**

#75 I oppose this proposal.



PC1503

**Name:** Teri Spray

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

I am commenting on Proposal 75 as I do not support this proposal. Murdering wolves to control the moose population is not the answer. By doing so you not only hurt the wolves, the moose, the ecosystem, but the very balance of nature itself. If left alone, natural predators by nature will control the populations within their territories. Wildlife and this planet survived just fine prior to mankind stepping in thinking they need to control things. Let the natural world and mother nature take care of their own, that is the way it should be without any interference from man.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

---



PC1504

**Name:** Bernhard Stachelberger

**Community of Residence:** Vienna/Austria

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I oppose the aerial gunning of wildlife in Alaska strongly and vehemently since this bears no benefit overall. This brutish behavior must stop.

---



PC1505

**Name:** Dawn Stackpole

**Community of Residence:** Crowley Texas

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposal 75. The killing of wolves and bears will cause an unnatural balance in the ecosystem.

---



PC1506

**Name:** Victoria Stake

**Community of Residence:** Denali

**Comment:**

OPPOSED

This would be damaging to the area and bring significant harm to these at risk populations.

Proposal 75

Proposed by ADFG

Add Department removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears to Unit 16 Intensive Management Plan as follows: notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land-and-shoot permits as a method of wolf removal and may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783.

---



PC1507

**Name:** Sara Stanton

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75.

---



PC1508

**Name:** Trevor Staples

**Community of Residence:** Eagle River

**Comment:**

Ammending my prior comment to oppose proposal 75

---



PC1509

**Name:** Teresa Steer

**Community of Residence:** Seattle

**Comment:**

OPPOSE PROP 75

Brown Bears are protected in the Lake Clark Park and Preserve. Their populations do not know where man's boundary lines are. Alaska offers a unique glimpse of wildlife that should not be destroyed.

---



PC1510

**Name:** Clark Steffen

**Community of Residence:** nashville

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposal 75 because I believe it will prove detrimental to the environment.

---



PC1511

**Name:** Jarrett Steil

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I adamantly oppose the slaughter of the bears in Proposal75

If they pose a threat, relocate if need be. Otherwise, leave them be.

---



PC1512

**Name:** K Steinbach

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

75 unreasonable, outrageous, cruel

---



PC1513

**Name:** Susan Stephens

**Community of Residence:** Indiana

**Comment:**

#75. I oppose hurting/killing the brown bears to control the number of bears.

---



PC1514

**Name:** Will Stephens

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75, unit 16; the airborne taking of wolves and bears

---



PC1515

**Name:** Katie Stephenson

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Proposal Number 75 - I vehemently oppose this proposal. There is no scientific or verifiable evidence to suggest that allowing the state to kill off wolves and bears will increase/help moose population or human moose harvest. It defies logic to throw hundreds of thousands of tax dollars away on such a venture (as this kind of proposal would certainly cost the state) when there is no evidence that this would actually help increase moose population. In fact, the data is to the contrary - research actually shows that predator culling DOESN'T help increase human moose harvest. In addition, national and international public opinion is overwhelmingly against these types of measures, as they are outdated and not backed by logic or reason. There is no reason to waste tax dollars in this way - if the data from nearby intensive management against bears and wolves in nearby areas from the 2024 annual report to Board of Game is any indicator, it cost the state \$612,000 to manage bear and wolf population. This proposal suggests killing of 100 wolves - that's \$6,120 per wolf - this is an INSANE cost to the tax payers for absolutely NO gain whatsoever.

---



PC1516

**Name:** Heather Sterling

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Having lived in Alaska for 50 years I have followed these measures and the results of efforts to increase moose populations by destroying large portions of the predator populations. I find it very unbalanced, and actually decreasing the health of the moose and caribou by allowing unnatural measures, and obviously ignoring the results of studies. Please do not waste money and resources with these measures again. I oppose Proposal 75, and ask that you spend time observing the research already done.

---



PC1517

**Name:** Jan Stern

**Community of Residence:** Barnum, MN

**Comment:**

Proposal 75, I strongly OPPOSE. Why must humans cheat when killing wildlife? Aerial shooting, leg hold trapping etc is a cowards way to "manage" any species!

You know that the random slaughter of wolves only creates even more problems because killing an alpha results in the rest of the family to go w/o a leader (much like america will soon be under trump).

It's past time we humans are held accountable for what we do to other animals & our land.

Also in case you didn't know, when a large portion of a species is killed off, the remaining ones will breed more! (like humans!) so killing does NOT solve any problems.

THINK, it's not illegal yet!

---



PC1518

**Name:** Cheryl Stevens

**Community of Residence:** Perth

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. It has been proven that the reduction of wolves is detrimental to the health of the environment. Messing with the eco system in any capacity has far reaching consequences, not to mention the morality of slaughtering wolves and bears.

---



PC1519

**Name:** T Stevens

**Community of Residence:** Naknek

**Comment:**

P 75: Neither rational or supported by current science. Based on management concepts from 30+ years ago. Where are the monitoring programs to determine the impact on predator numbers as a consequence of this ill-considered action?

There is insufficient scientific and administrative oversight and this opens the floodgates to additional aerial gunning programs. That is NOT what I'm paying taxes for.

Even if you want to turn a blind eye to the Miller, Person & Bowyer paper, the public entitled to see definitive data that show this is an effective management technique and will not a cause further imbalance among both predator and prey populations.

There's an alarming disregard for long-term, science-backed solutions that support the health of the whole ecosystem. Proposal 75 is misguided. It is also disrespectful to hunters, residents and visitors and will prove to have a net negative impact on tourism thanks to the appalling optics of BOG ignoring science and gunning down wildlife.

---



PC1520

**Name:** Brandy Stevenson

**Community of Residence:** Manitoba, Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Please DO NOT move forward with the unnecessary killing of these animals on their own home land. PLEASE leave them alone and let them be, it is too cruel and unnecessary of an idea to be put into action. NOT RIGHT. Choose to be better please.

---



PC1521

**Name:** Lisa Stewart

**Community of Residence:** Utah

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 OPPOSE

Slaughtering brown bears is cruel. We can and need to learn to coexist. Humanity needs wildlife.

---



PC1522

**Name:** Jess Stibbe

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

I am very against proposition 75

---



PC1523

**Name:** Michael Stock

**Community of Residence:** Portland, Oregon

**Comment:**

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSAL 75:

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which would allow the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to cruelly slaughter Alaska's wolves, black bears, and brown bears in Game Management Unit 16, right outside two of America's treasured national parks, in an effort to increase the moose population. Proposal 75 would allow up to 80% of wolves and black bears and 60% of brown bears in Unit 16 to be killed by a variety of methods across a 20,000-acre area bordering Denali and Lake Clark national parks.

The proposed aerial gunning is particularly concerning. Aerial gunning is an indiscriminate method of killing carnivores that involves gunners using airplanes or helicopters to chase and shoot the animals. This harmful, costly activity also poses threats to humans and nontarget animals. The disturbance caused by low-flying aircraft can disrupt habitats, cause significant stress (for people and wildlife), and lead to the displacement of nontarget animals from their natural territories.

The slaughter contemplated by Proposal 75 is not only inhumane, it is also unsupported by science, which shows that a changing climate, not predators, is the greatest threat to Alaska's moose and caribou populations. Past mass killings of native carnivores carried out by the department in the name of "predator control" have not led to an increase in moose and caribou numbers.

Ignoring all these facts, the department now seeks to bring its failed "wildlife management" practices to the doorsteps of two of the crown jewels of the national park system. Denali and Lake Clark national parks were established to protect and preserve precious natural resources, including native wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of current and future generations. Native carnivores are essential to maintaining healthy ecosystems. If the department begins slaughtering these vital carnivores as proposed, the greater Denali and Lake Clark ecosystems will suffer from their loss.

These killings, and the ecological harms that will cascade from them, will rob millions of people of the full benefit of the wild, natural character of these protected places. Proposal 75 is morally and scientifically indefensible. The board cannot allow the department to engage in a cruel mass slaughter of wolves, brown bears, and black bears. Please reject Proposal 75.

Thank you for considering my views.



**Name:** Arianna Stockl

**Community of Residence:** Palm Bay

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which 9 aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state: Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural

landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year. According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

---



PC1525

**Name:** Eric Stone

**Community of Residence:** Boston

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - OPPOSE

---



PC1526

**Name:** Janice Stormer

**Community of Residence:** Palmer, AK

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 5AAC92.122 Intensive Plan VI I DO NOT support this proposal. Nature goes through cycles. Do we kill most of the lynx when the hare population diminishes because they have reached that part in their cycle where the lynx have reduced the numbers that were not sustainable for long periods of time? Nature will even itself out if we humans do not intrude. We have more than enough legal bear hunts for people to seek that iconic bear rug to reduce the numbers. My son is a caribou and moose hunter and many times does not come home with meat for the freezer. That is the way hunting is. I would not advocate killing of the wild apex predators to increase his chances. Not all Alaskans want to see less bears and wolves and more moose and caribou. At times the decisions of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game make me ashamed to be an Alaskan and thereby guilty by association. Last year's Intensive Plan where there were so many killed was bad enough, let's not repeat the same shameful mistake again.

---



PC1527

**Name:** CC Storms

**Community of Residence:** Collinsville, CT

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposal 75. These magnificent creatures are part of the land of the delicate ecosystem. They have lived And thrivedfor thousands of years with no human intervention. It is cruel and unnecessary. Please think twice before messing with mother nature, And the natural cycle of animals as we have done enough damage to our environment, which creates difficult living situations for them

---



PC1528

**Name:** Susan Stough

**Community of Residence:** Cross, SC

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

Oppose is my stance.

Reasoning:

Aerial assault on animals is a form of torture that has no form of discretion as to which animals get shot. In the chaos that is created by a helicopter or plane chasing down living creatures who are beyond scared for their lives, there is no way to choose which ones are shot. Are you just going to gun them all down? Taking a wolf population down to 35 animals, but bears of two kinds in the hundreds shows who you are really targeting! People come to your parks to see more than geographical sights and vegetation. We come to experience the animals too! These animals are entitled to live on the areas that haven't been encroached upon by humans. This plan is poorly conceived and a "quickest and easiest" resort, instead of a well thought out approach that is humane and effective, like birth control for the population control. Do not allow this type of "cowboy gun down" to continue to be the norm!

---



PC1529

**Name:** Nancy Strange

**Community of Residence:** Kansas

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75. I oppose the practice of culling wolves, brown bears, and black bears to artificially increase caribou populations. This intensive predator control program is ecologically damaging, ethically questionable, and ultimately unsustainable. To further explain its Ineffectiveness: scientific studies have shown that artificially reducing predator populations provides only a temporary boost to caribou numbers. Other factors like habitat quality, weather patterns, and disease play a more significant role in caribou population dynamics.

Why it's an Ecological Disruption: Large predators play a vital role in maintaining healthy ecosystems. They regulate prey populations, preventing overgrazing and promoting biodiversity. Indiscriminate culling disrupts these natural balances, leading to unforeseen consequences for the entire ecosystem.

Ethical concerns: Culling apex predators like bears and wolves raises serious ethical questions. Eliminating them to serve human interests is morally problematic.

Alternative Solutions: The primary focus should be on the root causes of caribou decline. This includes protecting critical caribou habitat, mitigating the impacts of climate change, and managing human activities that disrupt caribou migration patterns. More scientific studies and data need to be collected. Perhaps other predators like coyote are a factor.

I urge you to reconsider the current predator control policies and invest in long-term, sustainable solutions that prioritize ecosystem health and respect the intrinsic value of all wildlife.

---



PC1530

**Name:** Jeanine Strobel

**Community of Residence:** Novato, CA

**Comment:**

I am writing to respectfully voice my strong opposition to Proposal 75. I travel to Alaska to see the beautiful wildlife and nature. Alaska is know all over the world for the natural beauty and excellent stewardship of the land. Areal hunting of wolves and bears is a stain on how Alaska is percieved. Science shows us that the apex predators are a valuable part of the ecosystem and actually contribute to healthy hers of moose, elk and deer. Please follow the science and end the cruel and barbarac practices of aerial shooting and trapping of wolves and bears. Thank you so much, Jeanine Strobel

---



PC1531

**Name:** Jay Stump

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is unethical and completey unnecessary. The moose population is not in dire need of restoration. The wolf population is not worth it at all. Wolves are dying out and they need to be protected, not killed for moose.

---



PC1532

**Name:** Katie Sturgill

**Community of Residence:** Vista, CA

**Comment:**

OPPOSE PROP 75

This is an extremely lazy and irresponsible means to an end. Random aerial shooting instead of increased bear and wolf tags is robbing the area of the opportunity to see any economic benefit from the removal of a keystone species. Would you rather contribute to predator and pray collapse, rather than a research based increase of predator tags? This is an opportunity to drive economy to an underrepresented area. This is not conservation, it's wastefulness and unacceptable.

---



PC1533

**Name:** Siva Suk

**Community of Residence:** Salt Lake City, Utah

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. The bears and wolves around Lake Clarke are a world heritage and that ecosystem should be allowed to regulate itself naturally

---



PC1534

**Name:** Lea Ann Sullivan

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposal 175 - OPPOSED! I am shocked & horrified to think these beautiful creatures are seen as being so disposable. This is beyond cruel! And at such a huge cost to humanity & our planet. What utter disregard for these magnificent wolves & bears! We are better than this!

---



PC1535

**Name:** Christa Sullivan

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I do not have the time to go through every one of your propositions. It is clear you are putting forth overwhelming information and forms to deter people from having input.

I vote for animal rights, for the continuation of Alaska's wildlife to have rights to live and thrive without human intervention. This includes shortening hunting seasons, prioritizing indigenous rights over others to sustenance, and to the abhorrence of murdering bears, wolves, other predators, for the sake of more hunting. Nature finds its balance with no need of external interference.

This so extremely angering that prop 75 is being put forth and HIDDEN as one of the last propositions. Make this prop known and allow the public to have input in this decision. Also make this form more realistic for the average working class citizen... you really think people have time to fill out 80+ propositions? Do not drown out voices with admin.

This is angering that those who call Alaska home are the ones also trying to destroy its beauty. Humans are not meant to be the only predator. Nature has always found balance, humans are unneeded to intervene.

---



PC1536

**Name:** Janeen Sullivan

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Please do not approve prop 75 regarding the killing of bears and moose in the greater lake Clark area. Bears and wolves are critical to the ecosystem and should be maintained. No helpful purpose is gained by the destruction of these animals.

---



PC1537

**Name:** Colton Sullivan

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, AK

**Comment:**

\*The following is all regarding proposal 75\*

I think this is an incredibly cruel thing to do for selfish gain. I am a hunter but I do value life. This reduction is incredibly unethical. While these animals may not be humans it would in essence be a complete and total slaughterfest, and possibly even considered next to a genocide of the animals on the hit list in the Lake Clark.

The predators work by taking out what is usually the easiest target which are either the young or possibly the sick and injured. And the hunters want the big prize targets which would clean out the gene pool of the many large and healthy animals leaving only a relatively weak genetic pool which would ultimately harm the ecosystem.

Up until I first heard of this proposal I've never heard of something so unethical and selfish in my life. Shame on whoever thought of this. If the proposal to eliminate wildlife in Unit 16 gets passed and was about money, may the bank accounts of those who formulated this wicked plan be cursed.

This is almost as bad if not worse than Julius Caesar of the Roman Empire bringing in 500 lions and chaining them up just to kill them for fun.

---



PC1538

**Name:** Lily Summerville

**Community of Residence:** South Lake Tahoe

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75 in Alaska because brown bears are important to the environment

---



PC1539

**Name:** Catherine Sunga

**Community of Residence:** Philippines

**Comment:**

I oppose the killing of Bears and or Foxes and or any animal! Proposal 75

---



PC1540

**Name:** Alex Suttman

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I reject prop 75 due to the inhuman and and unethical modalities and the devastation it will have on the ecosystem.

---



PC1541

**Name:** Wenona Suydam

**Community of Residence:** Kodiak alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. I am against the shooting of the bears, wolves and black bears. This is an insane killing spree of viable animals. The population takes care of itself. Look at what happened in Yellowstone when man decided to play God. Please do not allow this senseless killing.

---



PC1542

**Name:** Shannon Swiger

**Community of Residence:** Gardners, PA

**Comment:**

Typing this while wearing my Wasilla sweatpants that I purchased in Wasilla's WalMart 3 years ago, go figure. As an avid backpacker who recreates in Alaska's backcountry frequently, I'm appalled by Proposal 75. "In another generation there will not be any salmon or moose or caribou left and Alaskans will be scratching their heads, making excuses and blaming bears or trawlers or Democrats or any other boogeyman they can come up with except terrible management by Alaskans.

20 years of ignorant "predator control" from fixed wing aircraft had no effect except to give big payouts to trigger happy yokels."

---



PC1543

**Name:** Cait T

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

This is in regards to Prop 75, which I oppose. Please reconsider the culling of bears and wolves in your area. History has proven that wiping out predator populations has been a detriment to the ecosystem that they are a part of. Rather than limit these populations to increase ungulate populations, consider alternative methods, such as temporarily limiting the harvesting of caribou. Research has shown that without predators, prey have higher chances of spreading disease and overgrazing. I'm from Colorado which has recently re-established wolves and it's a proven conservation method.

---



PC1544

**Name:** Molly Armanino, Tahoe Climate Change Action Network

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

NO TO PROPOSAL 75. The proposal is one page. I see no ecological evidence that this will improve the ecological systems. Keystone species are pivotal to healthy ecosystems. Arial shooting is massacre. This is a disaster and is close to the public eye. I personally have 20,000 followers on Instagram and will use my platform to gain momentum to advocate against this. This will become national news if this passes, the lack of studies and evidence will be highlighted.

---



**Name:** Naomi Takimoto

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

First and foremost, I would like to ask every one of the decision makers on Prop 75, why and for what purpose truly makes you feel the need to kill any wildlife in their natural habitats, specifically all those important carnivore predatory species such as wolves, bears, and any big cats? Why do you need to kill them so much?

We're talking about all the keystone species that in fact regulate the ecosystem of the entire our environment, which we humans heavily depend on for our survival. Without these carnivorous predatory species indigenous to the region, the balance of the biodiversity and the ecosystem in the region will be corrupted disastrously. The science has already proven more than once that mankind can never re-regulate and rejuvenate the region's environment once we humans destroyed, but only when a couple of wolf packs reintroduced to the region where once humans killed thousands of wolves and extinct them completely, these wolves have proven that they can rejuvenate the entire region's environment completely and beautifully!

Within a couple of years since the reintroduction, these wolves smartly reduced overpopulated deer and elk to the appropriate numbers, that let's vegetation regrow and the more vegetation will bring various insects and rodents as well as giving the soil more nutrients and strength to hold the ground while the river started running through those nutrients rich land, the fish came back, birds came back, then beavers started moving in to create dams to attract more species into the region, after all, reintroduced packs of wolves have shown us the fact that they are the keeper of nature, they are the irreplaceable keystone species that regulate and maintain the balanced ecosystem in order to keep the region's environment healthy and safe for all diverse species share the gifts of nature and coexist peacefully in harmony.

And, we humans can be a part of this beautiful nature, if we want. Only if we humans respect all the species, stop demonizing specific predatory species such as wolves for some twisted greed and fetishism purposes, and humbly accept our role as stewards of natural world, to love and care for the entire environment and all the wildlife on this beautiful blue planet.

If, only if we all commit to this honorable role as stewards of this planet where we share everything with every single species, and only act responsibly and behave sustainably with unconditional love and humble respect for every living beings, finally our future will become bright.

I believe you know deep down in your heart, that you agree with me on this prop 75. We must protect all of our precious predatory species, wolves and bears in this case. Killing wildlife in such magnitude is not only destruction of the entire environment of all the surrounding regions, but also huge disastrous mistakes that will negative impact on everything and everyone in the region, as much as surrounding areas, economic and environment value of the region both will go down significantly if you carry on such evil slaughters of these irreplaceable important species as I described above.

---



**Name:** Naomi Takimoto

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

This is my correct submission of comment and prop survey oppose to prop 75.

First and foremost, I would like to ask every one of the decision makers on Prop 75, why and for what purpose truly makes you feel the need to kill any wildlife in their natural habitats, specifically all those important carnivore predatory species such as wolves, bears, and any big cats? Why do you need to kill them so much? We're talking about all the keystone species that in fact regulate the ecosystem of the entire our environment, which we humans heavily depend on for our survival. Without these carnivorous predatory species indigenous to the region, the balance of the biodiversity and the ecosystem in the region will be corrupted disastrously. The science has already proven more than once that mankind can never re-regulate and rejuvenate the region's environment once we humans destroyed, but only when a couple of wolf packs reintroduced to the region where once humans killed thousands of wolves and extinct them completely, these wolves have proven that they can rejuvenate the entire region's environment completely and beautifully!

Within a couple of years, these wolves smartly reduced overpopulated deer and elks to the appropriate numbers, that let's vegetation regrow and the more vegetation will bring various insects and rodents as well as giving the soil more nutrients and strength to hold the ground while the river started running through those nutrients rich land, the fish came back, birds came back, then beavers started moving in to create dams to attract more species into the region, after all, reintroduced packs of wolves have shown us the fact that they are the keeper of nature, they are the irreplaceable keystone species that regulate and maintain the balanced ecosystem in order to keep the region's environment healthy and safe for all diverse species share the gifts of nature and coexist peacefully in harmony.

And, we humans can be a part of this beautiful nature, if we want. Only if we humans respect all the species, stop demonizing specific predatory species such as wolves for some twisted greed and fetishism purposes, and humbly accept our role as stewards of natural world, to love and care for the entire environment and all the wildlife on this beautiful blue planet.

If, only if we all commit to this honorable role as stewards of this planet where we share everything with every single species, and only act responsibly and behave sustainably with unconditional love and humble respect for every living beings, finally our future will become bright.

I believe you know deep down in your heart, that you agree with me on opposition to prop 75.

We must protect all of our precious predatory species, wolves and bears in this case. Killing wildlife in such magnitude is not only destruction of the entire environment of all the surrounding regions, but also huge disastrous mistakes that will negative impact on everything and everyone in the region, as much as surrounding areas, economic and environment value of the region both will go down significantly if you carry on such evil slaughters of these irreplaceable important species as I described above.

---



PC1547

**Name:** Akshay Talegaonkar

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I am opposing extension of proposition 75 to all of unit 16 targeting 80% killing of wolves, 60% of brown bears, and other wildlife directly from helicopter. The habitat for all wildlife has been threatened by human intervention for decades and this region in Alaska is last remaining habitat. This proposition would significantly risk further negative impact of wildlife population and result in irreparable damage to the conservation efforts.

---



PC1548

**Name:** KELLY TANGUAY

**Community of Residence:** OREGON

**Comment:**

Prop 75

I OPPOSE PROP 75 PLEASE DO NOT PASS.

I do NOT agree with IM objectives for Unit 16.

If this proposal passes, it would help the department reach goal to KILL:

- 73 -80% of wolves (would stop if the population was reduced to 35)
- 60 - 80% of Black Bear (would stop if the population was reduced to 700)

60% Brown Bear (would stop if population was reduced to 375)

ADFG has decided to increase predator control in order to boost ungulates populations. Instead of increasing bear and wolf hunting quotas which could have directly benefited local economies and brought additional funding to wildlife agencies, ADFG is requesting the ability to ELIMINATE bears and wolves using random aerial shooting AND using state-owned aircraft, instead of gradually increasing predator hunting tags to guard against a boom and bust cycle.

THIS IS NOT CONSERVATION. This is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind. This is LAZY and IRRESPONSIBLE wildlife management in a place that deserves so much more care.

Unit 16 shares its southern border with Lake Clark National Park, one of the last pristine brown bear habitats left on earth. The brown bear population here is already under extreme threat from the devastating development of the Johnson Tract Mine, collapsing silver salmon runs, and the impending threat of continued salmon run decline. We stand to lose SO MUCH. I, WE DO NOT want to be robbed of another natural wonder.

---



PC1549

**Name:** Cheryl Tanner

**Community of Residence:** ALBERTA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - the killing of Alaska bears and wolves. This is inhumane and uncalled for. Leave nature to take care of itself as it always does. Haven't humans done enough harm by taking up their habitat!?! The ego system needs to be left alone. The numbers for bears and wolves is declining each year and soon will be at risk of extinction. Humans have done enough damage to this planet. Let things be!! I am Opposing this proposal.

---



PC1550

**Name:** Alisha Taylor

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, and wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in our beautiful state.

Alaska is renowned for its stunning natural landscapes and diverse wildlife, which attract millions of visitors each year.

According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, wildlife viewing generates approximately \$2.5 billion annually for the state's economy. This figure highlights the importance of maintaining healthy populations of iconic species like bears and wolves, which are critical to the ecosystem and serve as a major draw for tourists.

National parks such as Denali and Katmai are prime examples of how wildlife viewing can be a sustainable and profitable alternative to lethal population control methods. In these parks, visitors come from all over the world to experience the thrill of seeing these magnificent animals in their natural habitats. The economic impact of these experiences extends beyond park gates, benefiting local businesses, hotels, and tour operators. In 2021 alone, Denali National Park welcomed over 600,000 visitors, contributing significantly to the local economy.

Moreover, aerial gunning not only raises ethical

Thank you - Alisha T.

---



PC1551

**Name:** Diane Taylor

**Community of Residence:** Clam gulch, Alaska

**Comment:**

I oppose any and all culling of wolves, bears, and other wildlife in Alaska! As a resident of this state for over 46 years, the proposed "management" of killing hundreds of Alaska's wildlife through aerial hunting is inhumane and appalling! I STRONGLY OPPOSE Proposal 75 which would add the removal of wolves, brown and black bears to the Intensive Management Plan for Unit 16. This proposal is ludicrous!

---



PC1552

**Name:** Jamin Taylor

**Community of Residence:** Eagle River

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

Opposed

I strongly oppose the proposed aerial killing of predators in unit 16. This practice is outdated and will cost the state much more than it hopes to gain. There are better ways to handle this. Lake Clark is a world renowned place for watching and photographing coastal brown bears and wolves. This would affect Alaska's tourism industry negatively, an additional cost. This proposal can not be implemented.

---



PC1553

**Name:** Sabrina Taylor

**Community of Residence:** Bald Knob

**Comment:**

Against proposal 75

---



To: State Board of Game

Dated: December 25, 2024

Re: Opposition to Proposal 75

I oppose Proposal 75 and encourage the Board of Game to do so as well.

## **I. THE BOARD IS OBLIGATED TO MANAGE ALL WILDLIFE, INCLUDING PREDATORS, UNDER A SUSTAINED YIELD PRINCIPLE**

The Alaska Constitution states that “wildlife...belonging to the State shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses.”<sup>1</sup> This constitutional duty to maintain wildlife on a sustained yield principle applies to both predators and prey.<sup>2</sup> As the Alaska Supreme Court explained “[i]t is the Board's constitutional and statutory duty to apply principles of sustained yield when it adopts predator control plans; this is not a policy question subject to Board discretion.”<sup>3</sup>

The Board of Game is mandated to adopt regulations that provide for intensive management programs to restore the abundance or productivity of big game prey.<sup>4</sup> The Alaska Supreme Court held that “game” includes any species of mammals and thus “both the constitutional and statutory principles of sustained yield apply to wolf and bear populations.”<sup>5</sup>

The current proposal to implement an intensive management plan by allowing department employees to conduct aerial culling of wolves, black bears and brown bears is not based upon any sustained yield principles as to these predators.

## **II. THE CURRENT PROPOSAL DOES NOT MEET THE REGULATORY OR STATUTORY INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES**

The Board is only authorized to implement regulations that are designed to achieve goals set forth in A.S. 16.05.255(e). Amending 5 AAC 92.122 to permit aerial hunting of wolves, black and bear browns does not meet the statutory or regulatory requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alaska Const. art. VIII, § 4

<sup>2</sup> *West* at 696.

<sup>3</sup> *West v. State, Bd. Of Game*, 248 P.3d. 689, 699 (Alaska 2010).

<sup>4</sup> A.S. 16.05.225(e) as interrupted by the Alaska Supreme Court. *West* at 697.

<sup>5</sup> *West* at 698.



The stated purpose of Proposal 75 is to reduce the wolf population in GMU 16B to 35-55 wolves; however, it would amend the regulation by permitting aerial killing of bears as well as wolves. The purpose of implementing a predator control program is to “make progress towards achieving the Unit 16(b) intensive management objectives for moose.”<sup>6</sup> There is no current population data to support a finding that GMU 16 moose populations are below 6,500 and obtaining reliable moose estimates is notoriously difficult in this region.<sup>7</sup> The regulatory target number of 35-55 wolves only permits reducing wolf populations to these levels as part of an intensive management plan. Proposal 75 does not rely upon any current data linking the aerial killing of wolves, black or brown bears to the achievement of any intensive management objectives.<sup>8</sup>

Moose harvest numbers have been increasing, not decreasing. Moose harvest numbers in GMU 16(B) for 2023 were 207; 2022 were 275; 2021 were 237 compared with 2006 when only 127 moose were harvested or 2007 when only 109 moose were harvested.<sup>9</sup> The latter harvest numbers followed a period of aerial killing of predators which was implemented in December 2004.<sup>10</sup>

Multiple factors are linked to changes in moose populations, not just predation. Numerous studies have linked increased moose calf mortality rates to deep snow winters. According to USDA historical snow data for Schwenta, the area has seen historically heavy snows in 2024 (51 inches), 2022 (53 inches) 2020 (63 inches).<sup>11</sup> The Department’s own webpage on moose confirms that moose populations see significant declines after severe winters.<sup>12</sup> According to the ADFG webpage moose numbers in GMU 16(B) declined “about 20 percent after the severe winter of 1989-90.”<sup>13</sup> The Schwenta snowfall in winters 1989 and 1990 were 45 and 65 inches respectively. Severe winters continue to impact moose populations.

---

<sup>6</sup> 5 AAC 92.122(b)(2)(C).

<sup>7</sup> See Brockman, C. J., and T. C. Peltier. 2018. [Wolf management report and plan](#), Game Management Unit 16: Report period 1 July 2010–30 June 2015, and plan period 1 July 2015–30 June 2020. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Species Management Report and Plan ADF&G/DWC/SMR&P-2018-24, Juneau.

<sup>8</sup> 5 AAC 92.122(b)(2)(A), (6)(A). “[T]he commissioner will review, modify, or suspend program activities as follows: when the mid-point of intensive management objectives for the moose population is achieved.”

<sup>9</sup> Alaska Dept. Fish and Game [Harvest Reports](#).

<sup>10</sup> Brockman, C. J., and T. C. Peltier. 2018. Wolf management report and plan, Game Management Unit 16: Report period 1 July 2010–30 June 2015, and plan period 1 July 2015–30 June 2020. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Species Management Report and Plan ADF&G/DWC/SMR&P-2018-24,

<sup>11</sup> USDA monthly historical snow [data](#).

<sup>12</sup> [ADFG webpage on moose](#).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*



### III. THE BOARD SHOULD CONSIDER THE IMPACTS ON WOLF PACK DYNAMICS

The Board of Game has an obligation to protect and sustain all of Alaska's wildlife. While I understand that the constitution and statutes allow the Board to prioritize uses, as a resident of Alaska I encourage the Board to consider it a priority to maintain healthy wolf packs. These packs border and live within two of the State's National Parks: Lake Clark and Denali. These wild places are what make Alaska the State that it is and the state that I choose to call home. I lived and worked in Lake Clark National Park where wolves are a critical aspect of this intact ecosystem.

The impact of human-caused deaths of wolves around Denali National Park was the subject of a recent research study published in the journal of *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment*. The study concluded that human-caused mortality triggers instability in gray wolf packs.<sup>14</sup> Packs affected by human-caused wolf deaths were less likely to reproduce, while losing a pack leader decreased the chances that the pack stayed together or had pups the next year. Smaller packs are likely to dissolve and larger packs are more resilient and productive. A similar study in Wisconsin also concluded that "[p]ack size had a positive effect on pack persistence and reproduction."<sup>15</sup>

I ask this Board to sincerely consider the impacts of this proposal and reject adopting Proposal 75.

---

<sup>14</sup> Cassidy, K. 2023. [Human-caused mortality triggers pack instability in gray wolves](#). *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*.

<sup>15</sup> Zubiria Perez, A., Kellner, K.F., MacFarland, D.M. *et al.* [Effects of lethal management on gray wolf pack persistence and reproduction in Wisconsin](#), USA. *Sci Rep* **14**, 9895 (2024).

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-60764-6>



PC1555

**Name:** Ann Marie Teder

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposal 75, which would authorize ADFG staff to kill black bears, brown bears, and wolves with the use of aircraft, including helicopters, in all of Game Unit 16 to “achieve [predator] reduction goals”.

The aim is to reduce wolves by 70 to 80%, resulting in a population of 35 to 55 wolves (.34 - .54 wolves/100 square miles) for Unit 16B.

Reduce brown bear populations in 16B by 60%, and 80% for black bears, resulting in an estimated abundance of 375 brown bears and 700 black bears. There is no reliable information on black bear population status or trends in this area. Despite this, the Department made a “removal” goal of 60-80%.

All of these actions are for hunters who want to hunt moose. The proposal does not benefit animals. Some parts of the proposal don't even help the hunters.

---



PC1556

**Name:** Kennedy TenHagen

**Community of Residence:** Grand Haven Mi

**Comment:**

I am commenting on Proposal 75. Slaughtering that much of the bear and wolf population is horrific. This is their home, they deserve to live freely. People travel to national parks to experience all parts of nature, large animals included. This proposal is heinous.

---



PC1557

**Name:** Matt Tenold

**Community of Residence:** Everett, WA

**Comment:**

For proposal number 75 i oppose the proposal since gunning down bears and wolves especially from helicopters is sickening. Nature is better at managing populations of animals. Wolves and bears are especially important for managing the ecosystem of wild areas. Please let nature manage itself. Humans don't know anything about nature. Wolves and bears help keep the natural environment beautiful. The wildlife places we enjoy will cease to exist if you gun down natural wildlife.

---



PC1558

**Name:** Diana Tetterton

**Community of Residence:** Frederick, Maryland

**Comment:**

Gunning down wild animals is cruel and barbaric. If bear or wolf populations are legitimately out of control, we as an evolved, intelligent species can utilize more humane methods of managing that problem. I strongly oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1559

**Name:** Axel Teyke

**Community of Residence:** henderson. NV

**Comment:**

Strictly oppose prop. 75

---



PC1560

**Name:** Susan Urang, The Human Race

**Community of Residence:** The Lower 48

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is cruel, grossly unfair, and harmful to a functioning ecosystem in removing necessary predators by such UNFAIR methods as shooting them from aircraft.

---



PC1561

**Name:** Kim Santell, The Rainbow Rescue

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal #75 The senseless gunning down of wildlife.

---



PC1562

**Name:** Adrian Cortes, The wildlife collective

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal 75-

This is a cruel and senseless act of violence against innocent creatures. Alaska, we can do better than this. AF&G has acknowledged that predator culling has made no significant difference to the caribou population so to gun down hundreds of bears and wolves from helicopters is not only inhumane but also environmentally destructive. These animals are vital to the delicate balance of the ecosystem. We cannot stand idly by while such a tragedy unfolds. Please, reconsider this proposal and choose compassion over cruelty.

---



PC1563

**Name:** Jeanne Thibonnier

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Do not shoot predators on top of chain food. Consequences will be disastrous.

---



PC1564

**Name:** Dr. Stacey Thomas

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, AK

**Comment:**

Proposition 75 is not justifiable and responsible wildlife conservation nor management. This is deplorable on every level. As a citizen and a veterinarian, I vehemently oppose this proposition and request that more reasonable, humane methods of conservation be put in place. Destroying a wildlife population is not in the best interest of anyone, most of all the wildlife that we share these spaces with.

Dr. Stacey Thomas

---



PC1565

**Name:** Rachel Thomas

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. I find it immoral and detrimental to the ecosystem to diminish the bear and wolf populations there, especially by such a hefty amount and so close to the borders of protected land.

---



PC1566

**Name:** Shiloa Thomas

**Community of Residence:** Sooke, BC

**Comment:**

I oppose proposition 75.

It is inhumane and completely goes against the preservation of ecosystems and biodiversity.

It is so hypocritical of the department that is for conservation to consider killing so many species to preserve ones that can be hunted by humans. Why should animals pay the price for the decline in populations that had nothing to do with them. Next thing you know there will be too many deer and moose as has happened in other areas and they will starve to death. Please do not allow this to go ahead in one of the most wild and special places we have left on the whole planet. Please do the right thing, it's much easier to save these lives than to destroy them.

---



PC1567

**Name:** Angela Thomason

**Community of Residence:** Newnan, Ga

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 -

I recently visited Alaska back in May of this year and was able to go out and see the bears. These bears are such a blessing and should be protected and acknowledged as a worthy part of our ecosystem. Gunning down bears from helicopters is barbaric and unacceptable to our eco system. Bears are citizens of the world just as we are and deserve to be able to live a good life. Be humane and just say no to this terrible proposal.

---



PC1568

**Name:** Libby Thompson

**Community of Residence:** Arizona

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75 The cull of 90+ brown bears last year shocked the environmental/biology community last year due to its unproven and dubious science and ethical concerns. Culling apex predators is not a natural process, disrupts the ecosystem and ignores the very real other reasons for declines in populations of animals like caribou such as climate change. Further, placing a greater value on caribou, not to mention on human hunters of caribou, over the value of brown bears is not the type of decision the Board should

be making. The tourism money generated by tourists sounds more like politics to me than anything resembling science or stewardship of the land and wildlife. If money is your main interest, I note many tourists are drawn to Alaska for its unspoiled beauty - including the LIVING wildlife. Aerial cull of bears and wolves, especially at such a high rate, is grotesque and i am unequivocally opposed to the Board placing greater value on humans and caribou over the lives of apex predators such as brown bears and wolves.

---



PC1569

**Name:** Gloria Thompson

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I oppose Article 75. My husband and I have been residents of AK for more than 54 years. What you are doing to our wildlife is a travesty. I hate to say I'm from AK anymore.

---



PC1570

**Name:** Drew Thomson

**Community of Residence:** Revelstoke

**Comment:**

As a wildlife biologist I strongly oppose bill 75. Aerial culling is illogical and unethical.

---



PC1571

**Name:** Ethan Thoren

**Community of Residence:** Jacksonville

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is abhorrent. What a dreadful, disgraceful concept to even ruminant over. Anyone in support (and especially those who drew up the idea in the first place) should be deeply ashamed.

---



PC1572

**Name:** Kymry Todhunter

**Community of Residence:** Washington State

**Comment:**

I oppose prop 75. Killing a vast number of bears is not an ecologically sound plan.

---



PC1573

**Name:** Alejandra Tolley

**Community of Residence:** Diamond Bar

**Comment:**

I firmly oppose proposition 75.

---



PC1574

**Name:** Jennifer Tolo Pierce

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I strongly urge you to oppose Prop 75 and the aggressive and inhumane killing of wolf, black bear, and brown bear populations by aerial attack. The proposed methodology is disrespectful and cruel and not the solution to the problem it was engineered to address. Mass killing of predator species is not going to reverse negative impacts of climate change. Rather, it poses a threat to essential and delicately balanced biodiversity and to any economy that relies on the health of the environment and that biodiversity to survive. PLEASE VOTE NO.

---



PC1575

**Name:** Angela Tomasulo

**Community of Residence:** Juno

**Comment:**

Protest proposal 75.

---



PC1576

**Name:** Jan Tomsen

**Community of Residence:** Denali

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 for IM of predators in unit 16

I am against this proposal. It's like trying to put out a wildfire with just your backyard garden hose. The deep deep snow winters (such as in 2020) have hit moose populations hard, and the reduction in lichen dominated tundra habitat is a worldwide slow death bell for caribou. Taking out all the wolves and bears possible is a very temporary measure in the long term population ebb and flow of the ungulates. If the Board of Game wants to make meaningful changes for IM to maximize hunter harvest, it needs to think more global. Taking out 90 rats of a population of 100 rats might give you very temporary relief, but they breed so fast within a few years it won't matter. Spending money on aerial predator control is a waste of everybody's time and state money. Keep it for the PFD, or schools. Or renewal energy that can help address the real problem (warm, wet winters).



PC1577

**Name:** Lori Townsend

**Community of Residence:** Albuquerque, NM

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which would authorize helicopter hunting of bears and wolves in Unit 16. This proposal is problematic for several key reasons:

The fiscal impact is unjustifiable. ADFG acknowledges significant costs to the department, yet similar intensive management efforts have shown no conclusive positive results. The department's own data from the Mulchatna caribou herd management efforts shows no appreciable population increases despite substantial investment.

The method raises serious ethical concerns. Helicopter hunting eliminates any possibility of fair chase and reduces wildlife management to aerial slaughter. While initially targeting wolves, the proposal would allow immediate expansion to bears without requiring additional scientific justification.

The ecological consequences could be severe. Bears and wolves are apex predators that maintain ecosystem balance. Their removal could trigger cascade effects that ultimately harm the moose populations this proposal aims to protect.

Better alternatives exist. Rather than pursuing costly aerial hunting, we should focus on proven strategies like habitat restoration, addressing poaching, and targeted local management. ADFG's own reporting suggests unreported hunting may be a significant factor, yet this proposal overlooks non-lethal solutions in favor of an expensive, unproven approach.

I urge you to reject this fiscally irresponsible and ecologically unsound proposal in favor of more sustainable wildlife management practices.



PC1578

**Name:** Abigail Trachtenberg

**Community of Residence:** Boca Raton

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose Proposition 75 because it puts Alaskan brown bears at serious risk. These bears are not only an iconic part of Alaska's wildlife but are also essential to maintaining healthy ecosystems. Weakening their protections—whether through reduced habitat safeguards or expanded hunting regulations—could have devastating consequences for their populations and the environment as a whole. Protecting these animals isn't just about conservation; it's about recognizing their critical role in the ecosystem and the long-term impacts of our decisions. Let's prioritize sustainable, science-based policies to ensure these incredible creatures are around for future generations.

---



PC1579

**Name:** Rex Tranquilli

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, Alaska

**Comment:**

Proposal 75, OPPOSE:

Humans have done enough damage to this planet and its inhabitants. The fact that we think we have the right to control other species' populations is disturbing and tragic. This is a national park that we're talking about here. Literally a forest where bears should feel safe and at home. And you're looking for a license to murder because... why? It's interesting how when one ethnic is singled out and obliterated in the human population it's called genocide, but when humans aim to wipe out vast amounts of animal population it's called "population control." It's disgusting.

Leave the wildlife alone.

---



PC1580

**Name:** Travis Travis

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Do not hurt the bears (Proposal 75 opposition)

---



PC1581

**Name:** Tina Triantafillos

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

I was sincerely disheartened to learn about Proposal 75 and the Department of Fish and Wildlife considering this large scale cull of bears and wolves. Tragic. As someone who has worked with the Canadian Wildlife Service (Ontario region), I cannot support this. Even with invasive species, we do not condone aerial eradication of any mammals.

Alaska is known and renowned as one of the last remaining outposts of pristine ecosystems and wildlife. Your tourism industry depends on it. This is malarkey.

I oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1582

**Name:** Justin Trospen

**Community of Residence:** La Pine, OR.

**Comment:**

Proposal 75.

I oppose this proposal. The cost of aerial gunning of predators is not justified for the dubious results of top down (literally) ecological or ungulate management. To me this is just a way to support the out of state hunter economy and doesn't support subsistence hunters. This area is near very iconic national treasures like Lake Clark and this sort of activity is a very bad optic for other forms of tourism that the state depends on.

---



PC1583

**Name:** Wynter Troy

**Community of Residence:** DuPage county

**Comment:**

Proposal 75- I am against proposal 75. Large predators are crucial to a healthy ecology because they act as natural regulators of prey populations, preventing over grazing in maintaining biodiversity by controlling distribution abundance of their prey species.

---



PC1584

**Name:** Daphne Trudeau

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - OPPOSE - By ADFG's own admission: "Adoption of this proposal would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities" (ADFG comments on Prop 75, Page 224). The Intensive Management program against bears and wolves a few hundred miles west cost \$231,000 in 2022 and \$612,000 in 2023 (page 14, 2024 annual report to Board of Game) Predator control as a whole has accounted for ~\$2.5 million in lost federal funding, as Pitman Roberts funds cannot be used for Intensive management. At a time when ADFG has almost no funding for non-game programs and the State is struggling for cash, it is unwise to dedicate another quarter million dollars each year to predator control programs that have yet to be deemed effective.

---



PC1585

**Name:** Laura Tuke

**Community of Residence:** Jerrawangala

**Comment:**

#75.

Do not kill bears or wolves

---



PC1586

**Name:** David Turchetta

**Community of Residence:** Rhode Island, USA

**Comment:**

This is plain and simple morally wrong, unethical, inhumane and barbaric on all levels of compassion and reverence for OUR wildlife. This will not only be a slaughter of innocent life and knowingly create an unbalanced ecosystem for the will of special interest groups and under the table politics, but it also causes sane people to question the moral/emotional disconnect with the necessary intelligence needed of the natural world around them including the integrity of our Fish and Game Departments. Proposal 75 is murder of the innocent and vulnerable.

---



PC1587

**Name:** Elizabeth Turner

**Community of Residence:** Northampton MA

**Comment:**

I humbly ask that you consider rejecting Prop. 75 as poor management for Alaska's iconic bears. These treasures deserve that best plans possible to preserve them and their environment. Thank you.

---



PC1588

**Name:** Sammi Turner-Richardson

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I am commenting against proposal 75.

A healthy ecosystem requires predators to keep the herbivore balance. There has to be predators for an ecosystem to be able to sustain itself. There is so much science proving this I do not understand why this proposal was even a thought in anyone's head. If you want to go out and hunt hunt, something that you can eat. Trophy hunting is egregious and disgusting and useless. Hunting from air is even more so.

Hunting from air reeks of cowardice. What this proposal would allow is for cowards to hunt predators that are necessary for the environment simply so that they can what? Have a trophy head on their wall. Why don't we let the environment sustain itself Rather than pretend that we are the dominant species and have dominion over everything else. Why is the science behind what a healthy ecosystem requires not being used when you create proposals. Hunting is fine. Fishing is fine. But there needs to be a limit on how we interact with our environment and hunting predators should not be promoted. There aren't enough of them as it stands.

---



PC1589

**Name:** Yevgenia Uritskaya

**Community of Residence:** Brighton, MA

**Comment:**

Oppose #75.

Reducing the amount of wolves and bears around the national parks, of course, means fewer of those animals enter the park, and fewer opportunities for visitors to these Alaskan national parks to see those animals. Potentially, that's a huge loss in tourism revenue for the state as wolf viewing is a big draw. According to a statement from PEER in 2019, when the Alaska Department of Fish and Game elected to open wolf hunting in areas bordering Denali in 2010, the success rate of viewing wolves in the national park was 45%. By 2019, the success rate had plummeted to 1%.

"Alaska's predator control policies are cruel and the epitome of penny wise and pound foolish," said PEER Executive Director Tim Whitehouse in the release. "The amount of tourist dollars from people seeking to view these predators in the wild dwarfs any incremental increase in hunting fee revenue the state hopes to realize."

By

Justin Housman

December 13, 2024

in National Parks Traveler

Submitted by Mike Murray on December 13, 2024 - 5:28pm. in National Parks Traveler

Apart from animal welfare concerns, there is ample evidence, including studies published by former ADFG biologists, that the State's aerial shooting of bears and wolves is generally NOT effective at increasing the numbers of caribou and moose for harvest. It is noteworthy that the Board of Game does not include any scientists among its board members. It is well documented that the AK predator control program does not follow National Research Council recommendations for monitoring and evaluating the effects and effectiveness of the State's predator control program. Here are a variety of information sources supporting the above. Too much information, I know! Just saying there is considerable scientific evidence suggesting legitimate concerns that the program does not accomplish what ADFG says it will.

<https://alcesjournal.org/index.php/alces/article/view/371/455#:~:text=In%201995%2C%20Governor%20Tony%20Knowles%20re%2Dquested%20that,1997>

<https://www.mdpi.com/1424-2818/14/11/939>

<https://alaskapublic.org/2023/07/20/alaska-predator-control-doesnt-result-in-more-moose-harvests-according-to-a-study-of-one-game-unit/>

<https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000090>

<https://www.investigatewest.org/news/in-an-era-of-climate-change-alaskas-predators-fall-prey-to-politics-17706542?media=AMP+HTML>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UcUSRqyMkYJKyA50iMz2ymyHoTNPW3C-/view>



PC1590

**Name:** Fran Katnik, Us citizen

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 needs to be opposed. These creatures need protection, not killing. You have the unique responsibility that you were taking care of these animals and these lands for all of the US citizens not just your area. Please do the right thing and enact protection for these animals Instead of killing them.



PC1591

**Name:** Robert Usgaard

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I am opposed to Proposal 75. The proposal is not science based and is void of ethics and professionalism. If I were to request up to date predator numbers, the state could not provide them. Bad legislative mandates are an irresponsible way to manage wildlife. The lack of data, expenses and inherent dangers to the participants preclude moving forward with Proposal 75.



PC1592

**Name:** Kirishanth Uthayakumaran

**Community of Residence:** Quebec

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

There's no need in hunting brown bears, and should not have any right to do so because it's part of nature, we as humans are the dangerous ones, if there's one thing that should be hunted are humans no offense, these animals just mind their own business and go about their day and protect their family why should us(human) remove that from a living creature, what if this was your case and your the one that needs to be shot while you have a family wouldn't it be the same thing, we as humans were taking away their homes, I'm sorry but I don't support killing animals!

---



PC1593

**Name:** Julie Utterback

**Community of Residence:** Tennessee

**Comment:**

I do not support Proposition 75 and am asking you to reconsider.

---



PC1594

**Name:** Ivan Val

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75.

---



PC1595

**Name:** Angie Val

**Community of Residence:** WA

**Comment:**

I oppose the Proposal 75!

---



PC1596

**Name:** Jennifer Valentine

**Community of Residence:** usa

**Comment:**

proposal 75, ariel gunning down of wolves is SICK IN THE HEAD - please reject this

---



PC1597

**Name:** Jennifer Valentine

**Community of Residence:** usa

**Comment:**

please do NOT move forward with Proposal 75,

---



PC1598

**Name:** Bianca Vallance

**Community of Residence:** Le Roy, NY 14482

**Comment:**

I oppose #75

---



PC1599

**Name:** Mariana Valqui

**Community of Residence:** Puerto Maldonado

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the aerial hunting due to:

**Inhuman and Unethical Methods:** Aerial shooting and lethal removal are cruel, indiscriminate, and cause unnecessary suffering to wildlife. History has shown these methods escalate quickly without proper oversight.

**Threat to Ecosystem Balance:** Wolves and bears play vital ecological roles by regulating prey populations. Removing these predators destabilizes ecosystems, threatening biodiversity and long-term environmental health.

**Lack of Transparency and Oversight:** Proposal 75 grants broad, unchecked powers to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with no clear limits, oversight, or public accountability—setting the stage for widespread and indiscriminate killing.

**Conservation and Economic Risks:** Healthy predator populations are vital for Alaska's wilderness and tourism economy. Lethal predator control undermines these populations, harms conservation efforts, and threatens wildlife-based economic opportunities.

---

**Name:** Brooke Van Allen

**Community of Residence:** San Diego, CA

**Comment:**

Dear Members of the Board of Game,

I am writing to strongly oppose Proposal 75, which seeks to permit the widespread killing of bears, wolves, and other predators in Alaska. This proposal is not only scientifically unsound but also poses severe ecological, ethical, and economic consequences. I urge the Board to reject this measure for the following reasons:

**1. Disruption of Ecosystem Balance**

Predators such as bears and wolves play a critical role in maintaining the balance of ecosystems. Scientific research demonstrates that predators regulate prey populations, which in turn influences vegetation health and biodiversity. For example, studies on wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone National Park revealed that predators prevent overgrazing by herbivores, fostering healthier ecosystems overall (Ripple & Beschta, 2012). Removing significant numbers of these keystone species in Alaska could result in cascading negative effects, including habitat degradation and reduced biodiversity.

**2. Ineffectiveness of Predator Control**

The rationale for predator control often hinges on the assumption that reducing predator numbers will increase populations of prey species like moose and caribou. However, numerous studies, including research published in *Wildlife Biology* (Boertje et al., 2010), have found that predator reduction is not always effective in boosting prey populations. Factors such as habitat quality, food availability, and climate change have far greater impacts on prey population dynamics. Killing predators may therefore fail to achieve the intended management goals while causing unnecessary ecological harm.

**3. Ethical and Cultural Considerations**

The mass killing of predators is deeply troubling from an ethical standpoint and undermines Alaska's long-standing reputation for wildlife stewardship. Predators hold significant cultural and spiritual value for Indigenous communities and others who view these animals as vital to the natural heritage of the region. This proposal disregards these perspectives, threatening the cultural integrity of those who rely on balanced ecosystems for subsistence and connection to the land.

**4. Economic Impacts**

Wildlife tourism is a major contributor to Alaska's economy, and predators like bears and wolves are among the most sought-after species for wildlife viewing. Allowing Proposal 75 to pass could harm Alaska's tourism industry by reducing opportunities for visitors to experience these iconic animals in their natural habitats. A healthy predator population not only supports biodiversity but also sustains ecotourism, a critical and renewable economic resource for local communities.

**5. Moral Responsibility to Protect Biodiversity**

At a time when global biodiversity is under threat, Alaska has a moral responsibility to protect its unique wildlife. Proposals like 75 undermine this responsibility by prioritizing short-term gains over long-term ecological stability. The United Nations and other global organizations stress the importance of

preserving biodiversity to combat climate change and ensure future resilience. Alaska should strive to be a leader in sustainable wildlife management, not an example of its failure.

### Conclusion

Proposal 75 is a short-sighted and scientifically unfounded measure that will harm Alaska's ecosystems, cultural heritage, and economy. Rather than adopting such extreme measures, I urge the Board to invest in science-based wildlife management strategies that emphasize habitat conservation, non-lethal predator management, and coexistence. Rejecting Proposal 75 is not only the right choice for Alaska's wildlife but also for the people who value and depend on these animals.

Thank you for considering my comments. I trust the Board will make a decision rooted in science, ethics, and the long-term wellbeing of Alaska's natural ecosystems.

---



PC1601

**Name:** Catherine Van Straten

**Community of Residence:** Wyoming

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. If predator populations need to be reduced, please do so responsibly by gradually adding more hunting tags for those animals.

---



PC1602

**Name:** Ruth Vander Ark

**Community of Residence:** Holland

**Comment:**

I believe it is immoral , and unethical to kill so many of the brown, black bear and wolves. You will decimate the population. These animals are part of our world and need to be treated with respect.

I oppose #75.

Please do not approve this. Listen to the scientific evidence.

---



PC1603

**Name:** Ellen VandeVisse

**Community of Residence:** Palmer AK

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75

5 AAC 92.122. Intensive Management Plan VI.

Add Department removal of wolves, brown bears, and black bears to Unit 16 Intensive Management Plan

To Members of Board of Game,

Dec 27 2024. I have just learned about this proposal to kill a high percentage of wolf, brown bear, and black bear populations in Unit 16. I respectfully submit my comments.

I strongly oppose this proposal for the following reasons.

It is customary for any government policy /action to have a careful assessment, thoughtful development of problem-solving, budget & analysis of costs and benefits, scientific monitoring and thorough evaluation.

I oppose this Proposal 75 because

1. The proposed plan. What is the need and for whom?

What are the needs of all concerned, e.g. hunters, wildlife watchers, ecosystems involved, Native residents, herd health, etc.? What prior proof or evidence is there that predator destruction is an effective management plan to increase hunter harvest of large game? Have you truly looked at research?

As an ecologist/biologist, I am well-versed in the decades of scientific field research on the effects of predator removal on game mammal populations.

The research is clear and consistent: predator control programs like this proposed one

do not result in increased human harvest of large game. Have you truly explored a whole range of possible solutions?

2. What is the cost/benefit analysis?

Have you actually and fairly analyzed the costs and benefits? Do they truly justify the hoped-for outcome? Or does this originate from a special-interest population that seeks to serve itself only?

3. Project Evaluation--is there one?

Is there an evaluation plan and budget for it? How comprehensive and inclusive is it? Does it measure species diversity for on-going health of habitat? Or is this just a crude before-and-after head count of selective game you happened to like? Where is the plan to monitor and look at long range effects on the supportive ecosystems involved?

In summary, I strongly advise you to reject all efforts to pass Proposal 75. Why?

Because it

--is not grounded in research,

--lacks an inclusive systems-approach to costs and benefits,

--is outdated and ineffective,

--involves expenses (precious time and money) hard to justify within the context of State Budget shortfalls for things like teacher retirement..

Thank you for reconsidering this whole issue.



**Name:** Erinne Vargas

**Community of Residence:** Kitchenet

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE proposal #75.

This killing of innocent animals cannot be justified nor forgiven. It threatens biodiversity and crucial species lost already under threat from capitalism and the climate crisis. Be better humans. There are zero reasons to kill these wild animals. Let them be wild and STOP KILLING.

---



PC1605

**Name:** Michelle Vargas

**Community of Residence:** Lake Clark

**Comment:**

Oppose, proposition #75

---



PC1606

**Name:** Ruby Varney

**Community of Residence:** Lexington

**Comment:**

I Oppose 75! It's disgusting what people want to propose to do to these animals. They were here before us and will be here after us. Doing this type of hunting or reduction of the population would almost cause extinction without proper control.

---



PC1607

**Name:** Jessica Varrato

**Community of Residence:** Connecticut

**Comment:**

75 -OPPOSE

This would be horrific. We shouldn't be meddling and controlling nature. We've seen in the past when wolves were nearly extinct and how much the ecosystem flourished when their populations rebounded.

---



PC1608

**Name:** Karen Vasquez

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, Alaska

**Comment:**

Regarding proposal 75 to add aerial killing of wolves in South Central Alaska, I am adamantly against it. There are many reasons to oppose this proposal, but I will try to be as brief as possible. First of all, state-sanctioned killing of certain (predator) wild animals does not increase the populations of other wild animals. The heavy snowfall over the last several years caused increased starvation among the moose population in South Central. The number of dead moose found in the woods, along trails in my area of the state was enormous. Friends reported finding dead moose in their yards. Secondly, what gives the state the right to selectively kill wild animals when research states very clearly that the senseless slaughter of one group of wildlife will increase the population in another group? The study, "Efficacy of Killing Large

Carnivores to Enhance Moose Harvests: New Insights from a Long-Term View" conducted in 2022 concludes that "Our long-term case history offers new and important insights for managing moose via predator control, in any of its forms, which failed to achieve management objectives for moose harvests or otherwise affect the harvest of those large herbivores. This outcome clearly demonstrates that additional information regarding factors influencing moose abundance and harvests should be more fully considered before predator control is applied as a general management procedure on large geographic scales." The study seems to indicate the cause of the decline in the moose population can be attributed to climate change. The attempts by the state to "control" the carnivore population has failed and must end, not expand. Please reject proposal 75 for the reasons listed above and more that I will not go into. Alaska is a place of wonder and wildlife and it's the reason so many visit our state. The bear and wolf populations are crucial to our ecosystem and should be left alone. I oppose the state-sanctioned slaughter of any of these majestic creatures.

---



**Name:** Sharika Vasudevan

**Community of Residence:** CA

**Comment:**

Regarding proposal 75: To eliminate wildlife populations like this is inhumane and should be blocked at every step. We as a people need to learn to co-exist with the other beautiful creatures of this amazing world.

It is sad that Alaska is taking such a shameful step and if passed, it will be looked back at as a dark reflection on humankind.

---



**Name:** Kim Veneziano

**Community of Residence:** Sequatchie Valley TN

**Comment:**

#75, I oppose. Me and my close family members would someday like to visit Katmai National Park and Lake Clark area to see these brown bears in their natural habitat

---



PC1611

**Name:** Morgan Venzor

**Community of Residence:** Portland

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is absolutely outrageous and inhumane. This is NOT how to properly manage our wildlife and is disgraceful this is even a proposal.

---



PC1612

**Name:** Marie Verbytska

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Opposing proposal 75!

---



PC1613

**Name:** Robin Vergote

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

I am writing to strongly oppose the aerial killing of bears, Proposal 75 !

I am writing to oppose the killing of bears in general. They are part of natural wildlife of the Yellowstone area and deserve to be protected.

---



PC1614

**Name:** Yael Versluys

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE PROPOSAL 75

---



PC1615

**Name:** Jordan Vigus-Hurst

**Community of Residence:** United Kingdom

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. It represents unnecessary, cruel and barbaric killing of so many native bears and wolves. This would have devastating repercussions for other wildlife and the habitats in which these animals live.

---



PC1616

**Name:** Esmée Visser

**Community of Residence:** The Netherlands

**Comment:**

I oppose to proposal 75

It's outrageous to kill so much of the population.

---



PC1617

**Name:** Sarah W

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75! Unit 16 shares its border with Lake Clark National Park, one of the last pristine brown bear habitats. The brown bear population is already endangered due to the development of the Johnson Tract Mine, which has severely impacted the silver salmon runs. This ecosystem is at risk of losing a significant portion of its biodiversity if random aerial shooting is permitted.

---



PC1618

**Name:** MaryJo Wadsworth

**Community of Residence:** Sidney Maine

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is despicable. Beautiful living creatures deserve to live in peace. We have no right to take their lives because we think there are too many of them. This is their world too. Leave. Them. Alone.

---



PC1619

**Name:** Tyler Wagner

**Community of Residence:** Milton GA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is simply the dumbest proposal I have ever seen and would destroy the ecosystem of Alaska. It doesn't statistically benefit humanity in any way other than getting rid of these predators for the hell of it. These predators keep herbivore and prey populations under control where humans fall short. Additionally they're extremely interesting and fascinating animals that have survived and should continue to thrive in this way. Proposal 75 is such a lazy and stuck up proposal that does nothing except make wildlife less diverse and less manageable. If you take out apex predators the prey will only grow out of control and there will end up being a stupid proposal to have to reintroduce these predators. Let the ecosystem level out by itself.

---



PC1620

**Name:** Alexandrah Walker

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is an ecological atrocity. These animals have a right to live and deserve compassion and dignity. They are a part of this ecosystem. This proposal is a disgrace. Protection must be given to the bears and the wolves.

---



PC1621

**Name:** Kyle Walker

**Community of Residence:** 4052 Meckley RD Glen Rock, PA 17327

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 (OPPOSE) I am one of the explore.org bear watchers watching Brooks Falls bear cams the moment they come on until they power off in October, thousands watch the bear cams across the world, Brown Bears bring enjoyment, inspire people like me to get involved, so much so I'm writing a book of poetry about these bears to help the bear watching community, help the bears and help Katmai Conservancy through donating the proceeds from the book. I am on disability & these bears give purpose to people like me, why take that purpose away? By proposing 75 your telling the thousands into the hundreds of thousands you don't care about the bears they love from a helicopter? The bears they know number IDs by heart. It would be awful if the bears I'm writing about sharing the stories about would be killed in such away. Your 75 proposal affects so many more people you know outside Alaska. I'm praying you hear the voices of those watching and change your mind. For the Love of People that watch Bear cams on explore, on YouTube I Oppose proposal 75. Don't know how much you consider people outside the state that Love your State because of the Bears we love. Thank you for your time.

Kyle

---



PC1622

**Name:** Debbie Wall

**Community of Residence:** Manitoba, Canada

**Comment:**

I am writing in opposition to Proposal 75. Aerial gunning is inherently cruel and will affect not only the targeted victims, but other wildlife who will be traumatized by the sounds of helicopters and gunfire. This proposal appears to be predicated on improving the quality of wolf "pelts" and will benefit only those who profit from them.

Since we've put a man on the moon, the human population has more than doubled while that of the wild animal nations has more than halved. We are in the midst of the Sixth Mass Extinction and are losing species at an unprecedented rate. The survivors need full protection. We need to preserve whatever precious little wilderness remaining and re-wild much of that stolen to provide them with habitat to live and raise their families in peace.

As they have for millennia, carnivores such as wolves are capable of "managing" their own numbers and any human interference inevitably results in throwing ecosystems out of balance. It is 2024 and well past time to adopt peaceful coexistence and compassionate conservation strategies.

---



PC1623

**Name:** Lauren Wallace

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I vehemently oppose Proposal 75.

---



PC1624

**Name:** Thomas Walsh

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

No amount of agriculture justifies the killing of such beautiful animals. Oppose proposition 75.

---



PC1625

**Name:** Terry Ward

**Community of Residence:** Pembroke Pines

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 to gun down bears and wolves from a helicopter is absolutely insane. Let the animals live so locals can hunt and control the population that way. There's no need to mass slaughter animals like that, government over reach now a days is ridiculous go do something better with yall time. Touch grass or some shit.

---



PC1626

**Name:** Alexandra Ward

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose 75!!

---



PC1627

**Name:** Florian Warnecke

**Community of Residence:** Germany

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: Please stop the killing of the bears and wolves. The animals have the older rights to be here. We humans think we have to regulate everything, we don't!!! Leave Mother Nature alone, we have done enough cruel things to the natural world. Haven't we learned anything?

---



PC1628

**Name:** Justine Warren

**Community of Residence:** Bozeman

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposition 75. I have visited this area and it is one of the country's last pristine places. My experience there viewing bears will stay with me for a lifetime. If culling is necessary for ungulate herd numbers and resource scarcity for the bears, let it be by means that provide additional beneficial outcomes. Bring in revenue for the state by increasing hunting tags in this unit. It is less barbaric, has better public optics, and typical hunters have care for the animals they harvest/will use hide, meat, etc.

---



PC1629

**Name:** Layla Warren

**Community of Residence:** Cooper Landing

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75. Let nature be wild, it will correct itself. Humans cannot understand the complexities of the ecosystem and how all the animals interact. Up hunting permits if you must. But do NOT shoot animals from the air.

---



PC1630

**Name:** Cameron Wasserman

**Community of Residence:** Northern CA-Petaluma, CA

**Comment:**

I spoke with the wildlife biologist for proposal 75. I hope that you can bring the caribou and moose population to a healthy number. I just don't want too many wolves or bears being killed in the process. I want you to have a MINIMUM POPULATION REQUIREMENT FOR WOLVES, BEARS, CARIBOU, & MOOSE.

---



PC1631

**Name:** Bill Watkins

**Community of Residence:** Denali Park

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Wolf/Bear Killing Program in GMU 16 outside of both Denali and Lake Clark National Parks - Opposed

No references to populations studies of moose, wolves, grizzlies or black bears in GMU 16.

No discussion in how they determined a sustainable moose population range of figures. Nor, is there any discussion in whether the moose population is rising, falling or stable.

Due to the above, how can a sustainable hunt of moose be achieved if no studies have been done on the population as well as a census?

No discussion of habitat carrying capacity for moose as determined through recent studies or for bears and wolves.

No discussion of the condition of the moose habitat that is available in GMU 16.

No specific studies are mentioned regarding wolf numbers within the GMU 16. While the proposal does mention that a minimum count of 120 wolves took place in March of 2023, there is no mention of who did this count, what methodology they used, over what length of time, or any reference to a specific study.

Furthermore, there was no mention of any grizzly and black bear population studies within GMU 16. This is especially important due to the exceedingly low reproductive rate of grizzly bears as well as the difficulty in counting both black and grizzly bears.

Any mentioned of specific counts for both black and grizzly bears needs to be supported by recent scientific study and the methodology used. No mention of this was given in the proposal and guess work, outdated studies and/or extrapolations from them is unacceptable.

No discussion in which hunters (urban, rural, bush, out of state) that this predator control program is to benefit.

No discussion of eliminating/limiting urban and out of state hunters to grant greater moose hunting success to rural/bush communities. In fact, there was no discussion of rural/bush communities suffering from a lack of moose.

No discussion of the costs of this program for each year it is enacted up to and including 2031.

How is such a program fiscally responsible?

No discussion justifying why hunting is subsidized by state funding in predator killing proposals but no other form of recreation?

No discussion or studies on how such wolf/bear control would impact Denali & Lake Clark National Park wolf and bear population dynamics in both National Park ecosystems.

No discussion in how wolf killing disrupts the social dynamics of wolves and their family groups throughout the area. And furthermore the compensatory actions by wolves in reaction to that increased mortality.

No discussion in how increased grizzly bear control and especially females can devastate the bear population for years due to grizzlies having such a low reproductive rate.

No discussion of how harsh winters due to climate change (or other factors) can devastate the moose population far faster than any type of predation .

No discussion of the reasoning of issuing public aerial shooting permits or public land-and-shoot permits and may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783.

Am opposed to having ADF&G conduct any predator killing within GMU 16.

Am opposed to having the ADF&G commissioner allow aerial/land and shoot killing of wolves and bears without any public review and comment or debate over whether such a program is fiscally responsible.

If passed, this would allow Department aerial gunning in all of Unit 16, which borders the southern half of Denali NP/Preserve and the Northeast border of Lake Clark NP/Preserve.

All of these questions need to be answered first before any type of organized wolf and bear killing program be considered.

Proposal 82 - Palmer Trapping Setbacks - Support

50 yard trapping setbacks in the Palmer area. This proposal would help protect pet dogs from being trapped by trappers and is a common sense solution.

Proposal 11 - Shorten Brown Bear Seasons Near Katmai - Support

To minimize conflicts between non-consumptive and consumptive users.

Proposal 29 - Mulchatna Caribou Herd Population Review - Support

To determine calf survival to at least one year of age, whether the Mulchatna caribou population is increasing or not and the effectiveness of the state's predator kill program.

Proposal 2 - Open two bear baiting seasons in GMU Units 9, 11, 13, 14B, 14C, 16, and 17 - Oppose

Proposal 3 - This would allow the use of cellular cameras for taking bears over bait in Units 9, 11, 13, 14B, 16, and 17. Bear baiters would be allowed to use game cameras that communicate wirelessly to locate, identify, and monitor activity at bait stations. If adopted, it would likely be pursued statewide.  
Oppose

Support Proposals: 11, 18, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 42, 49, 61, 63, 80

Opposed to the following Proposals:

9, 12, 17, 32, 33, 34, 48, 57, 58, 59, 60, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 79,

---

**Name:** Victoria Watts

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Opposed to pro 75, inhumane euthanasia of wildlife

---



PC1632

**Name:** Evan Watts, Watts Wildlife Photography

**Community of Residence:** Gardiner, MT

**Comment:**

I am commenting on Proposal 75. I am vehemently opposed to Proposal 75. As someone who leads bear-viewing tours in Alaska, my income is dependent upon a healthy population of bears in the state, and the tens of thousands of dollars I bring into the state using guide services, lodging, bush planes, etc also only come into the state if I can lead a successful tour. Killing bears in an ecological stable system that requires no human interference is not only a waste of resources, but negatively impacts ecosystems and economics in the state. We need bears on the landscape to successfully lead tours... don't kill your own tourism industry.

---



PC1633



PC1634

**Name:** Katherine Webster

**Community of Residence:** Albuquerque

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal 75 which seeks to kill large numbers of bears! This plan is unscientific, cruel, and doesn't help anyone. Alaska has a reputation for beautiful landscapes and it's bears; the passage of the proposal would lead to negative press and hurt tourism.

---



PC1635

**Name:** Margaret Weems

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

Proposal 75

I oppose this proposal. I oppose it because I find it hard to understand why wolves and bears need to be killed in such vast areas of land uninhabited by humans. Alaska is one of the few places that bears and wolves can have so much land to be relatively uninterrupted by humans, and yet there is the want to kill them? I don't understand it, and I would hope to never hear or see of this happening. I hope everyone involved considers the consequences of these actions, and the destruction that humanity has already brought to wildlife just by existing.

---



PC1636

**Name:** Irina Wegemer

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75

The proposed culling of wolves and other predators is unethical because killing for sport is wrong. This is not "wildlife management", it's slaughter. Who are we to decide that one animal deserves to live and another one - to die? Alaska fish and game must know this basic rule? They always seem to encourage good hunting and fishing practices and humane wildlife treatment standards for local residents and tourists alike. So don't be hypocrites, stop using taxpayer money on unethical, inefficient programs. Cancel this predator killing plan now!

---



PC1637

**Name:** Charlie Wemyss-Dunn

**Community of Residence:** Massachusetts, United States

**Comment:**

If passed, Proposal 75 would be incredibly damaging to the wildlife of Unit 16, which borders the southern half of Denali NP/Preserve and the Northeast border of Lake Clark NP/Preserve and serves as critical dispersal lands for the bears and wolves in these treasured national parks. This proposal is not a decision made with local economies or natural resources in mind and is irresponsible wildlife management. Why not instead incrementally increase bear and wolf hunting quotas which could directly benefit local economies and bring additional funding to wildlife agencies. The brown bear population of Lake Clark NP in particular is already under extreme threat from the devastating development of the Johnson Tract Mine, collapsing silver salmon runs, and the impending threat of continued salmon run decline making the potential passing of this proposal completely devastating.

Please do not pass this measure and protect the wildlife that makes Alaska so incredibly valuable to our planet!

---



PC1638

**Name:** Debbie Wenger

**Community of Residence:** Sabetha, KS

**Comment:**

I oppose all actions in proposal #75. We have to protect these animals for extinction and inhuman treatment.

---



PC1639

**Name:** Lindsey Wennert

**Community of Residence:** Park City, UT

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to proposition 75. I travel to Alaska multiple times a year to view the predator animals that are being discussed in unit 16. I believe removing these animals will disrupt the ecosystem and lead to unintended consequences.

Naturalists and the general public, including myself agree that this type of management is outdated. Alaska's wilderness and diverse wildlife are treasures that draw so many people to the state. Tourists from around the world come to experience the majestic sight of bears, moose, wolves and other iconic species. These animals are not just vital to the ecosystem; they are integral to Alaska's identity, culture, and economy. Harming the population will tarnish the appeal as one of my top destinations.

Thank you for your attention and your help preserving Alaska's wildlife for future generations, Lindsey Wennert

---



PC1640

**Name:** Shaun Wewege

**Community of Residence:** Hohenbrunn (Germany)

**Comment:**

Opposed: proposal 75

There seems to be lack of consensus among environmentalists on the proposed measures. The cull is barbaric, lacking genuine dialogue with experts and community leaders, and is out of touch with genuine conversation efforts

---



PC1641

**Name:** Keeli White

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I, Keeli White, am opposing Proposal 75 which will be considered by the board at this meeting. Wildlife needs to be protected and left alone, our interference is not necessary.

---



PC1642

**Name:** Danielle White

**Community of Residence:** San Diego California USA

**Comment:**

PLEASE do not pass proposal 75. This is a horrendous cruel way to exterminate entire populations of bears and wolves. Both are needed for the ecosystem balance and your gunning them down in cold blood from helicopters is pointless. It's unfair to them by any measure. Let them live in peace.

---



PC1643

**Name:** Lexi Whitlock

**Community of Residence:** Nashville, TN

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75 in Unit 16, which aims to reduce the populations of brown bears, black bears, & wolves through aerial gunning. This proposal not only undermines the values of wildlife conservation but also threatens the significant economic benefits derived from wildlife viewing in this beautiful state.

---



PC1644

**Name:** Tracey Whitney

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

I vehemently oppose Proposal 75

---



PC1645

**Name:** Jennifer Wiegert

**Community of Residence:** Mishicot, WI

**Comment:**

PROPOSAL 75 - OPPOSED

Eliminating bears and wolves via aerial shooting is a horrific way of managing wildlife. This is not conservation - it's slaughter and an example of human intervention at its worst. The number to be shot would bring the bear and wolf population too low. Please do not move forward with this proposal.

---



PC1646

**Name:** Zachery Wiese

**Community of Residence:** Midland, MI

**Comment:**

I am in opposition of Proposal 75. The brown bear (and subsequent black bear population) serve a vital purpose in the ecosystem that should not be disturbed. Killing off animals within Unit 16 area is a cruel solution to population control and a cheap one at best. How would you like it if the government decided to do the same to you and your families to solve overcrowding? Do you like when school shooters kill kids? Do you think people who shoot up movie theaters are doing a favor for population control? If those sound wrong to you then I think your moral compass is intact enough to realize Proposal 75 is no better a solution. Leave the animals alone and find something else to control.

---



PC1647

**Name:** Emily Wiest

**Community of Residence:** New York State

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75.

Please don't kill these beautiful animals.

---



PC1648

**Name:** Nicole Wight

**Community of Residence:** Kansas

**Comment:**

#75

---



PC1649

**Name:** Nicole Rojas, Wild For Change

**Community of Residence:** Illinois

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. The suggested aerial gunning program is near some of the world's most iconic wildlife viewing areas. Predator control is unpopular with the general public. The State's reputation as a responsible wildlife manager is rightly beginning to deteriorate after nearly 200 bears were aerially gunned down in southwestern Alaska. Authorizing this program on such weak and poorly studied biological grounds damages Alaska's image and erodes public trust in the Board of Game to make sustainable decisions. More people want to see black and brown bears and wolves alive than dead. Alaska is our last frontier, and what makes it so special and iconic is the wildlife that inhabits it. Aerial hunting of these species shows poor judgment in managing wildlife populations, especially since this proposal lacks the necessary research and expertise from wildlife biologists. Reducing bear and wolf populations so drastically harms the ecosystem, as both carnivores are vital in managing prey populations and their foraging patterns.

---



PC1650

**Name:** Tricia Mejia, WildLifeCollective

**Community of Residence:** Spokane, WA

**Comment:**

To Whom It Concerns:

I am writing to oppose the Alaska Department of Fish and Wildlife plan to aerial kill predatory animals - Wolves, Brown Bears - Proposal 75. Studies show that killing these animals is not going to increase or improve the number of caribou or moose available to hunters to kill. The percentage that you plan to kill just because is outrageously high. These predatory animals are also Gods creatures and deserve to live just like anyone else or any other animal. Your intent to remove them for selfish reasons is not justified in taking their lives.

Tricia Mejia

---



PC1651

**Name:** Emily Wilhelm

**Community of Residence:** Green Bay

**Comment:**

Proposal 75. Opposition

I just don't think the science supports the need to manage wildlife populations to this extent. The communities of predators and prey have always kept a balance. I don't think it is wise to interfere. I hope the rationale for this proposal do not have ulterior motives, like profiteering.

---



PC1652

**Name:** riley wilkins

**Community of Residence:** alaska

**Comment:**

proposal 75- It's absolutely DISGUSTING that you are prepared to eliminate 60% of the local bear population. it's humiliating to the state & country as a whole that destroying a native & BENEFICIAL animal is even an option. get a grip on reality.

---



PC1653

**Name:** Sarah Wilkinson

**Community of Residence:** Santa Barbara

**Comment:**

I strongly urge the community to consider opposing proposition 75. I don't believe this a humane option.

---



PC1654

**Name:** Cindy Williams

**Community of Residence:** Oxford,MS

**Comment:**

Re:proposal 75

I am strongly opposed to such horrific measures to harm much needed wildlife in that ecosystem.

---



PC1655

**Name:** Elizabeth Williams

**Community of Residence:** Park City, Utah

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 - Oppose

I live in the Lower 48. You may think this issue doesn't affect me, but it affects all of us.

Here is my concern regarding Proposal 75. Aerial shooting is indiscriminate, the results of which will certainly be catastrophic to the bear and wolf populations in Unit 16 and surrounding areas. I am concerned that this type of wildlife management does not consider the long-term impacts on the wolf and bear populations and is not supported by current scientific principles of large predator management. Aerial gunning is not responsible wildlife management. It is inhumane. It is abject slaughter.

Since Alaska is one of the few places in this country where wolves and bears exist, it is up to you to manage these animals on behalf of all Americans. Your decisions regarding wildlife management don't just affect Alaskans. They affect us all. Please vote no to Proposal 75.

---



PC1656

**Name:** Jill Wilson

**Community of Residence:** Washington State

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75 as a wildlife and outdoor lover. I have had the privilege of witnessing brown bears in their natural habitat in the Alaskan coast. These beautiful apex predators play an important role in the ecosystem and should be left alone.

---



PC1657

**Name:** Ian Wilson

**Community of Residence:** Nashville TN

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 to reduce wild bear and wolf populations.

---



PC1658

**Name:** Zach Winter

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I have lived in Alaska my entire life and have grown up hunting and gathering with my dad. He always taught me to respect the animals and always made sure I knew that we were in there home and being able to kill an animal was not for sport but for food and learn and have respect for the land you live in. If YOU (Department of Fish & Game) decide to kill off more than half the population of brown bear, black bear and Wolves than we are not gonna have a healthy population of wildlife in our state. I understand that sometimes you have to kill some of the population of predatory animals to allow for a healthier moose and caribou population but I think proposal 75 is way overboard with what fish & game wants to do. I am Opposing prop 75 because I am an Alaskan and want to keep Alaska's wildlife healthy and make sure our grandchildren are able to enjoy it just as much as we have all enjoyed it.

---



PC1659

**Name:** Rebecca Witcher

**Community of Residence:** Louisiana

**Comment:**

Please do not allow Proposal 75 to go through. The cruelty of killing these bears is beyond inhumane. One could argue that the human race is overpopulated, so should we go out and shoot humans? These animals deserve better.

---



PC1660

**Name:** Rebecca Wolf

**Community of Residence:** America

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75 on account of the fact that it is not based in proven population control science whatsoever and will do more harm than good. Policy should be backed by research showing that it is worth doing, and this isn't. It will be a waste of resources and innocent lives. Reconsider and vote no.

---



PC1661

**Name:** Jacqueline Wolfson

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the unnecessary and cruel murder of defenseless animals in their own natural habitat. What purpose does the mass killing of these animal serve? Most especially on the scale that is proposed?  
Proposal 75

---



PC1662

**Name:** Janice Woodard

**Community of Residence:** San Diego

**Comment:**

I oppose #75. No need to kill more animals.

---



PC1663

**Name:** Natasha Woodcock

**Community of Residence:** UK

**Comment:**

#75 OPPOSE!

LEAVE NATURE AS IT WAS INTENDED. Killing innocent animals will disrupt the natural eco system.

---



PC1664

**Name:** Jessica Woods

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE proposition 75. Clearly an egregious position advocating the killing of brown bears and wolves, highlights significant ethical, ecological, and conservation concerns. These beautiful animals are crucial for maintaining a BALANCED ECOSYSTEM. Bears and wolves regulate populations of herbivores and smaller predators, which helps prevent overgrazing and promotes biodiversity. Removing them would disrupt these natural processes, potentially causing cascading effects that harm habitats and other wildlife. In addition, ethical considerations about animal welfare demand that we protect these species, rather than harm them for SHORT-TERM GAINS. Their roles in ecosystems are irreplaceable, and the loss of these species would lead to long-term ecological damage. Supporting conservation efforts, rather than lethal measures, aligns with our moral responsibility to PRESERVE WILDLIFE and ensure

the health of ecosystems for future generations. Killing these animals is not only unnecessary but also counterproductive to the broader goals of ecological sustainability and wildlife preservation.

---



PC1665

**Name:** Tara Woodson

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Oppose proposal 75 due to it being cruel and I believe there is better options if Alaska does need to lessen the populations of wolves and bears.

---



PC1666

**Name:** Emma Entress, World Animals News

**Community of Residence:** Brooklyn

**Comment:**

Proposal 75, OPPOSE. In a world where many species are being pushed to extinction by humans, the LAST thing we should be doing is killing more in their native habitat. This proposal is inhumane and should absolutely not be allowed to pass.

---



PC1667

**Name:** Jennie Worthington

**Community of Residence:** 4535 Allen Rd Randallstown, MD 21133

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose proposal # 75. It is completely inhumane and would benefit no one! You are proposing the slaughter of huge numbers intelligent and majestic beings. Apex predators are essential for a healthy ecosystem yet you want to kill them. It is criminal!

---



PC1668

**Name:** Emily Wright

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the changes to PROPOSAL 75, 5 AAC 92.122. Intensive Management Plan VI. This proposal is short sighted and is not supported by significant peer reviewed data.

---



**Name:** Soren Wuerth

**Community of Residence:** Girdwood, Alaska

**Comment:**

December 27, 2024

Soren Wuerth



Girdwood, AK 99587

Proposal Number: 75

OPPOSE

State Board of Wildlife:

Thank you for offering an opportunity to comment on an anticipated proposal to kill wolves under the state policy known as "predator control".

Your deadline for comment, coming during a week most Americans celebrate by taking time with their families, is unfortunately timed. A December 27 deadline has the effect of dissuading comments. I would like to request that, given the magnitude of public interest in this particular proposal, that you PLEASE POSTPONE/TABLE THE PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO EXTEND THE COMMENT DEADLINE.

As a lifelong Alaskan and having spent thousands of days in our state's backcountry, I have only seen a wolf in the wild TWICE. I've had encounters with every other animal, but A WOLF SIGHTING IS ON MY BUCKET LIST (and, it seems, EVERYONE ELSE'S)!

Why would you intentionally rob the ability for so many to experience the thrill of seeing a wolf (or brown bear, for that matter) in the wild? The department has little to offer (actually, nothing to offer) in the form of justification for killing off 70% of wolves in Unit 16.

Therefore, I am writing in opposition to ADF&G's proposal (#75) to kill wolves in Unit 16 for the following reasons:

- The proposal falls under a "wolf control" objective in the state's policy of "intensive management". Wolf killing efforts conducted under "intensive management" have failed to meet the plan's objective of increasing moose harvests. Though Proposal 75 neglects to mention this key objective of the "intensive management plan", the purpose for culling wolves is inherent in policy.

A study published in November 2022, "Efficacy of Killing Large Carnivores to Enhance Moose Harvests: New Insights from a Long-Term View", by three longtime biologists and researchers, shows that over four decades of the killing of thousands of wolves and bears, moose hunting DID NOT IMPROVE.

The study cited the failure of ADF&G to conduct adequate research. To wit:

With rare exceptions [18,22], predator-reduction efforts to benefit moose in Alaska have not been conducted within a research framework that monitors abundance or other critical attributes of both predators and prey over long-enough periods to determine if or why objectives related to increased ungulate harvests were achieved. Such shortcomings in the design of predator-prey research in Alaska

were recognized in 1997 by a National Research Council panel review [20]. In most instances, determination of a need for predator control and monitoring its effects are based on harvest data alone. Harvest data often are the only data collected consistently over long periods for both predator and prey species.

Meanwhile, ADF&G is basing its estimate for wolf abundance on a 26 year old study.

- Killing "at least 113 wolves" could devastate the wolf population as wolves pass information to offspring both genetically and socially. Disease and environmental factors, such as impacts caused by global heating, could exacerbate mortality of remaining animals.
- Seeing a wolf is the aim of the millions of tourists, who collectively spend much more money on this opportunity than the state will raise from hunting permits.
- The program is expensive. According to your own report, "intensive management" has cost the state \$843,000 in the last two years.

Please stay this execution order, conduct proper research, and give more Alaskans time to weigh in.

Thanks,

Soren Wuerth

sorenwuerth@yahoo.com



**Name:** Johan Wulfers

**Community of Residence:** Teramo, Italy

**Comment:**

Comment on Proposal 75

Dear honorable members of ADFG,

I am voicing my strong opposition to the ludicrous proposal of mass culling of brown, black bears and wolves in Unit 16. Why would someone in Italy care you may be wondering.

I am a former wildlife biologist and lived and worked in your great state for almost 10 years in ecotourism and I can honestly tell you, us foreigners are in awe of the beauty of your state and its vast natural wealth and wonders. As a guide for almost a decade, I took people from around the world who spent a lot of money to view the wildlife you propose to cull. Basically, the "charismatic megafauna" you propose to cull is worth the same as gold in ecotourism dollars and support ecotourism businesses all over your state, the U.S. and the world.

Secondly, as I have worked in both Denali and Lake Clark these animals are worth a great deal to state residents alive. People choose to live in the great state of Alaska for just that, a wealth of natural habitat and predators in intact ecosystems. Your proposal shifts a delicate balance and is not based on good conservation science.

All three species have an inherent right to exist in the vast wilderness that makes up Alaska. Where else in the world does this exist except North America?

We here in Central Italy are fighting to protect the endangered Marsican brown bear that many of you have not likely heard of. The Marsican bear has approximately 60 individuals left and is a subspecies of the European grizzly. The Italians are enamored with this small population of bears and fight the many threats they face. The reason I mention this is that the world looks at your state for its intrinsic value of keeping these magnificent creatures alive and thriving in their natural habitat. There are no places left which have what you have. I know. I've been to mostly all of them.

Please reconsider this culling and think from a global perspective. Your charismatic megafauna is worth more alive for the sake of humanity and our need for nature and for the sake of you being good stewards of the land and allowing the bears and wolves their own value in being alive in one of the last remaining wilderness's in the world. We as humans have destroyed so much, let's let the bears and wolves room to roam and be just that, bears and wolves. Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Johan Wulfers

Teramo, Italy

---

**Name:** Sandy Banks, WWF

**Community of Residence:** Playa del rey

**Comment:**

You must not pass 75 as it threatens wildlife that can not survive the onslaught.



PC1671

---

**Name:** Carlene Y

**Community of Residence:** Arlington, MA

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. This is a lazy and irresponsible method of reducing the population. Random aerials shooting instead of increased bear and wolf tags is robbing the area of the opportunity to see any economic benefit from the removal of a keystone species.



PC1672

---

**Name:** Claire Yang

**Community of Residence:** Seattle



PC1673

**Comment:**

Opposition to Proposal 75: The protection and maintenance of wolf and bear populations is crucial to the environment as they are keystone species. The type of short-term thinking that promotes killing these animals will jeopardize the environment in unforeseen ways, as we have seen in the past with unwarranted human intervention. Their populations still face a multitude of risks and we must let them recover rather than declining their numbers further.

---



PC1674

**Name:** Vicky Yang

**Community of Residence:** Rowland Heights

**Comment:**

Proposal 75: I am against the gunning down of predators because I believe there are more life-giving alternatives than to kill animals in cold blood.

---



PC1675

**Name:** Katie Yarnell

**Community of Residence:** Colorado, USA

**Comment:**

Dear Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75, which would authorize aerial gunning of wolves, brown bears, and black bears in Unit 16. This proposal raises serious ecological, ethical, and scientific concerns, and I urge the Board to reject it for the following reasons:

**Ineffectiveness of Predator Control Programs**

Numerous studies have demonstrated that predator control programs in Alaska fail to achieve their stated goals of increasing human moose harvests. These programs are not supported by scientific evidence that links predator removal to meaningful or sustainable increases in prey populations. Continuing these practices is not only ineffective but also wastes valuable resources.

**Outdated and Unscientific Wildlife Management**

Large carnivore management in Alaska, as proposed in this plan, reflects outdated and scientifically unsupported concepts. Effective wildlife management must include rigorous monitoring and evaluation programs to assess predator population dynamics and the broader ecological impacts of such interventions. Without these, we risk irreparably disrupting the delicate balance of ecosystems in Unit 16, which lies between Denali and Lake Clark National Parks—regions of immense ecological and cultural significance.

**Ecological Consequences of Large-Scale Predator Removal**

The proposed removal goals—73–80% of wolves, 60% of brown bears, and 60–80% of black bears—are extreme and would severely destabilize the predator-prey balance in Unit 16. Apex predators play a critical role in maintaining healthy ecosystems, and their large-scale removal could lead to cascading effects, including overgrazing by prey species, habitat degradation, and long-term ecological harm.

#### Lack of Transparency and Public Input

If this proposal is approved, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) would have full authority to develop and implement an Operational Plan for aerial gunning without further public input. This lack of transparency is deeply concerning and undermines public trust in wildlife management processes.

The use of aircraft, including helicopters, for aerial gunning is not only inhumane but also risks alienating the public, who increasingly value Alaska’s wildlife for its intrinsic and ecological worth rather than as a resource to be exploited.

I urge the Board of Game to prioritize scientifically informed and ethical wildlife management practices that reflect Alaska’s commitment to preserving its natural heritage for future generations. Proposal 75 is not aligned with these principles and should be rejected.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Katie Yarnell

---



PC1676

**Name:** Zach Yeamans

**Community of Residence:** Connecticut

**Comment:**

Commenting on behalf of proposal 75. I think this proposal is utterly absurd, bears are considered apex predators and I urge you to look at the state of our planets oceans where sharks have been harvested for fins. We as humans have a responsibility to protect our ecosystems from ourselves, shooting of bears from helicopters is outrageous and gives the animals no chance to avoid being gunned down.

---



PC1677

**Name:** Rachel Yessenow

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

I oppose proposal 75. This is irresponsible wildlife management at best.

---



PC1678

**Name:** Julie York

**Community of Residence:** Gardiner, Montana

**Comment:**

I am opposed to proposal 75 (Aerial Gunning Outside of Denali)

Studies have not demonstrated that the type of predator control program proposed results in an increase in the moose hunter harvest (Miller et al. 2022. Efficacy of Killing Large Carnivores to Enhance Moose Harvests: New Insights from a Long-Term View. Diversity 14(11), 939; <https://doi.org/10.3390/d14110939>).

Fluctuations in moose population numbers and harvest have most often been correlated with severe/deep snow winters and not solely by an increase in predator numbers. In addition, monitoring of predator effects on moose harvest has not been sufficient to make a simplistic broadscale proposal that significantly reducing predator numbers will automatically result in an increased moose harvest. It also does not support understanding the effects of predators in ecosystem function. A better use of funding for ADFG would be to monitor the effects of predators in areas of concern, habitat needs, and hunter harvest methods that lead to increased injury and stress of cows and calves. If hunter harvest regulations need to be imposed during that process, then that should be implemented.

Implementation of proposal 75 is a mistake for Alaskan wildlife.

Thank you.

Julie York

---



PC1679

**Name:** Jessie Zak

**Community of Residence:** US

**Comment:**

I cannot express how deeply I oppose Prop 75. It would be an utter travesty.

---



PC1680

**Name:** Alisha Zakowicz

**Community of Residence:** Illinois, USA

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 is a stop gap measure to a problem that needs a much more in depth solution....while brown bears and wolves may be “overpopulating” in the eyes of the Alaskan government, the brutal mass killings that would be made legal in this proposal would swing too far the other way and guaranteed create a crisis of two species becoming becoming in danger in the coming years of an extinction event. This proposal is cruel and impractical, and our country is better than a “kill everything” solution when it comes to our wildlife.



PC1681

**Name:** John Zeising

**Community of Residence:** Poncha Springs

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 opposed

---



PC1682

**Name:** Sandy Zelasko

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

I STRONGLY OPPOSE PROPOSAL 75.

Under no circumstances is there a reason to kill brown bears in areas adjacent to Lake Clark.

---



PC1683

**Name:** Lisa Zelnick

**Community of Residence:** Melbourne, Florida

**Comment:**

Although I am a Florida resident, attacks on our wildlife in any state affects all of us.

I strongly oppose Proposal 75, which would allow the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to cruelly slaughter Alaska's precious wolves, black bears, and brown bears via aerial gunning right outside two of America's treasured national parks. Proposal 75 would allow up to 80% of wolves and black bears and 60% of brown bears in Game Management Unit 16 to be gunned down across a 20,000-acre area bordering Denali and Lake Clark national parks.

Aerial gunning is an indiscriminate method of killing carnivores that involves gunners using airplanes or helicopters to chase and shoot the animals. This harmful, costly activity also poses threats to humans and nontarget animals. The disturbance caused by low-flying aircraft can disrupt habitats, cause significant stress (for people and wildlife), and lead to the displacement of nontarget animals from their natural territories.

The slaughters contemplated by Proposal 75 aren't only inhumane — they're also unsupported by science, which shows that a changing climate, not predators, is the greatest threat to Alaska's moose and caribou populations. Past mass killings of native carnivores carried out by the department in the name of "predator control" have \*not\* led to an increase in moose and caribou numbers.

Ignoring all these facts, the department now seeks to bring its devastating “wildlife management” practices to the doorsteps of two of the crown jewels of the national park system. Denali and Lake Clark national parks were established to protect and preserve precious natural resources, including native wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of current and future generations. Native carnivores are essential to maintaining healthy ecosystems. If the department begins slaughtering these vital carnivores as proposed, the greater Denali and Lake Clark ecosystems will suffer from their loss.

These killings, and the ecological harms that will cascade from them, will rob millions of people of the full benefit of the wild, natural character of these protected places. Proposal 75 is morally and scientifically indefensible. The board can’t allow the department to engage in a cruel mass slaughter of wolves, brown bears, and black bears. Please reject Proposal 75.

---



PC1684

**Name:** Ruth Zeltzer

**Community of Residence:** Washington, DC

**Comment:**

I oppose Proposal 75! Even though I don’t live in Alaska, I know that our environmental systems are all interconnected. With global warming and development it’s hard enough for wolves and bears to survive. We should be doing everything we can everywhere to protect our natural environment! Thanks for your consideration.

---



PC1685

**Name:** Joy Zepeda

**Community of Residence:** Kauai

**Comment:**

Please oppose prop 75. As humans, we do not have the right to brutally kill innocent bears and wolves. It’s disgraceful! Please protect the innocent lives. 🙏😊👉

---



PC1686

**Name:** Rebecca Ziebell

**Community of Residence:** Seattle, WA

**Comment:**

I’m writing to express my strong opposition to Proposal 75. I understand the desire to support moose populations, but helicopter hunting is fiscally irresponsible, unethical, shortsighted, and unsustainable.

From a fiscal standpoint, Proposal 75 represents a waste of taxpayer resources. ADFG’s own reporting fails to demonstrate the utility of intensive management activities in other areas (see: Mulchatna caribou

herd and overlapping confidence intervals). Meanwhile, ADFG acknowledges that "adoption of [Proposal 75] would result in significant costs to the department if department staff conduct control activities." Taxpayers deserve better stewardship of public funds.

From an ethical standpoint, aerial hunting is unfair and inhumane. This method makes it impossible for animals to flee or defend themselves; it is one-sided slaughter that is in direct opposition to the principles of ethical hunting. ADFG's wildlife management efforts should reflect our collective responsibility to treat all animals with respect and compassion.

In an effort to protect moose populations, Proposal 75 also fails to consider the impact of aerial hunting on the broader ecosystem. Apex predators such as bears and wolves play an essential role in balanced ecosystems, and removing them from the landscape could result in unforeseen consequences that may harm the very populations of moose that Proposal 75 aims to protect.

Finally, Proposal 75 does not consider non-lethal alternatives for predator population management. Scientific research supports more humane and effective ways to protect moose populations, including habitat restoration and reduction of human-related disturbances. These and other non-lethal methods offer a more comprehensive and sustainable conservation approach.

In conclusion, I urge the Alaska Board of Game to reject Proposal 75 in favor of fiscally sound, ethical, forward-thinking, sustainable alternatives. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

---



PC1687

**Name:** Brittany Zorn

**Community of Residence:** Maryland

**Comment:**

Proposal 75 OPPOSE

I am writing today to oppose this disgusting act of selfish genocide of a population of wildlife who have the right to exist. How dare you decide to play god in these animals lives. How dare you think you have the right to decide that a species dies, destroying wildlife and murdering sentient beings that deserve to be here just as much as you if not more. Do you want to know what species is truly overpopulated? Humans. Do you think we have the right to just decide 60% of them should be shot to death and murdered in cold blood? You have no right. Leave the animals alone. You people have done enough damage to these animals, to wildlife and to this planet. You have no right to make the decision to execute all of these innocent lives. You should be ashamed of yourselves. I oppose this disgusting, shameful and mortifying act of ignorant murder.

---