



PC1201

**Name:** Sangalang, Mal

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

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the expansion of aerial gunning programs targeting bears. These practices are inhumane and unjustifiable—especially when they involve killing mothers with cubs. There is no credible scientific evidence that this helps caribou populations recover. Alaska's bears deserve better. We need to protect—not persecute—these incredible animals.

---



PC1202

**Name:** Santiago , Heather

**Community of Residence:** Nevada

**Comment:**

When we were kids it felt like there was so much magic left in the world, in nature. Soon they'll be drilling and logging. They'll be selling off pieces off this nature until there's nothing left. This planet took care of us and is taking care of us. This is how we say thank you? These animals, These rivers, these lands depend on us to protect them. They can't speak but we all understand and refuse to listen. Total disregard and no respect. We are the only species that can change things but don't. We were given this garden, we've paved and destroyed it even for future generations.

Shooting these animals from a helicopter is wrong. We should be fighting to protect these animals and lands. Nature is pure. The last thing man didn't make or destroy YET. Our lands and animals. Even our oceans will be bled dry. Don't you want your children to experience the magic you did? Protect these animals.

In the end, when you've lived your life and stand before god. You will have to tell him you destroyed his garden. The gift he gave you. The destruction of innocence and purity for greed.

Defend the planet. Defend innocence. Defend the voiceless. Shooting bears from a helicopter is cowardice and cruel. Have the strength to fight for the earth. Stand up. They desperately need you. Please

---



PC1203

**Name:** Sartori, Silvia

**Community of Residence:** Treviso, Veneto, Italy

**Comment:**

I am deeply and unequivocally opposed to the aerial killing of bears in Alaska.

Shooting these majestic, sentient beings from helicopters is not wildlife management — it's a brutal and heartbreaking act of violence. Bears are intelligent, emotional animals who feel fear and pain just as any other living being does. To chase them down from the sky, without warning, without mercy, is an act that strips away every ounce of dignity from both the hunter and the hunted.

These are not just animals — they are mothers, siblings, individuals with lives of their own. Watching them fall from gunfire, terrified and alone in the wilderness they call home, is a tragedy that should never be justified by policy.

There are better ways — ethical, science-based, humane ways — to care for our ecosystems. We are stewards of this earth, not tyrants. Let us choose compassion over cruelty, coexistence over control.

Please end this senseless, violent practice. The world is watching. And the bears deserve better.

---



PC1204

**Name:** Sauer, Jeff

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I am a 40 year resident of Alaska and am interested in the conservation of our resources, and the responsible management of all of our wildlife. I strongly oppose the bear control proposed, and what has happened in the past couple of years. I also note the decision of bad faith found by the Superior Court regarding F&G. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

---



PC1205

**Name:** Saveri, Gabrielle

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Please stop killing the bears. It is cruel and inhumane. There is no scientific evidence that it affects the Caribou populations. It is a bad reflection on our country that we are killing our beautiful wild bear populations. People travel from all over the world to see these bears and now we are killing them. It makes no sense.

---



PC1206

**Name:** Savicka, Patricija

**Community of Residence:** Latvia

**Comment:**

There is no scientific evidence that killing bears in this way helps caribou population recover.

---



PC1207

**Name:** Saxena, Abhishek

**Community of Residence:** India

**Comment:**

I don't see why this news is kept hidden from the world. As humans we are not allowed to alter with the nature's own balance. Whatever is happening is a part of nature and the best we should do is secure our boundaries. Not enter theirs and kill them

---



PC1208

**Name:** Sayen, Laura

**Community of Residence:** Royal Oak, Michigan

**Comment:**

I am not from Alaska nor do I live there but I am conscious of the fragility of ecosystems and the hubris of humans to think we have the right and superior knowledge to disrupt them. I strongly oppose the proposal to allow Department Staff to kill brown and black bears under the unfounded assumption that it will protect the Caribou herds. The science does not align with this initiative and leaves one to wonder what the true motivation is to slaughter a vital contributor to an increasingly fragile ecosystem. Alaska is a beacon of wildlife habitat throughout the world. Without careful research, indiscriminate killing of brown and black bear is nothing but willful ignorance in action and a waste of public funds.

---



PC1209

**Name:** Schilling-Alvarez, Elisa

**Community of Residence:** Washington DC

**Comment:**

It is unacceptable that these bears are subject to such a killing spree for no justified reason. This must stop right now. It is mere cruelty!

---



PC1210

**Name:** Schirmer , Barbara

**Community of Residence:** Sheboygan, Wisconsin

**Comment:**

Please stop killing the bears. There is no proof that this will reinstate the caribou heard size.

---



PC1211

**Name:** Schirmer , Rebecca

**Community of Residence:** Susquehanna

**Comment:**

I do not support the needless killing of animals. It is up to us as human beings to use our god-given abilities to think of a solution. Will we make another species go extinct so we can spend millions of dollars trying to use their DNA to bring them back to life? We disrupt another ecosystem by killing off an essential species that's part of it? In no way, is killing a population of animals humane or effective.

---



PC1212

**Name:** Schmidt , Jo

**Community of Residence:** Nashville TN

**Comment:**

I 100% oppose to the killing of innocent brown bears & black bears in Alaska.!. There is NO Scientific proof that killing bears help the population of the caribou. Nursing bears being murdered and taken from their cubs is disgraceful. If there's no evidence to back your claim it's disgusting to believe you'd just murder these bears to "see". What if that was you?.

---



PC1213

**Name:** Schmittle, William

**Community of Residence:** CA

**Comment:**

Don't kill the bears. I'm opposed to thinning out by aerial shooting. RICICULOUS.

---



PC1214

**Name:** Schnirer, Dana

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Proposal # 4 AAC92.111

Intensive management for Mulchatna Caribou

Strongly Oppose

There is no science behind a move to decrease the bear population, to strengthen Caribou population. There is science behind decreasing Caribou population because of extreme logging and development in the Boeal forest however.

Dana Schnirer

---



**Name:** Schoebl, Sydney

**Community of Residence:** Ontario Canada

**Comment:**

Bears like other wildlife do not have a voice. But I will speak for them and say that this is wrong!

This is not management in any fashion. This is murder. If only humans could be put on trial for heinous crimes that they commit against wildlife and the environment.

---



**Name:** Schoen, John

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

John Schoen Letter to the Board of Game on Mulchatna IM 7-4-25

I am a 49-year resident of Alaska currently living in Anchorage. I am a retired wildlife scientist and worked professionally in Alaska for the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) as a wildlife research biologist, research coordinator, and senior conservation biologist from 1976 through 1996, including 10 years conducting brown bear research in SE Alaska. I also worked as senior scientist for Audubon Alaska from 1997 through 2011. I have hunted Mulchatna caribou and watched and photographed brown bears on the Alaska Peninsula and I maintain a strong interest in returning to observe and photograph bears in the future. I have closely followed the Mulchatna Intensive Management (IM) Program and have previously commented to the Alaska Board of Game (Board) and ADF&G on this program. I do not support Proposal 1 to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH) Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff (5 AAC 92.111 Intensive Management Plans, Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area).

**Summary:**

I will summarize my concerns here and follow with more detailed analysis. I do not believe that the Mulchatna IM Program to kill additional brown and black bears is adequately grounded in the best available science. (The Alaska Court has determined the program was adopted without adequate public notice and lacked credible, quantitative scientific supporting data.) I also do not believe the ADF&G reasonably followed its own protocols for intensive management. In addition, the Board and ADF&G have consistently ignored the 1997 recommendations of the National Research Council regarding predator control in Alaska. The Mulchatna caribou herd has a history of significant population fluctuations. Previous ADF&G research and management reports have attributed the recent population crash to adverse weather, habitat change, nutritional stress, illegal hunting, and disease rather than bear predation alone. I also believe that the current population and harvest goals set for this herd are unrealistic, and recent ADF&G reports have suggested that those goals should be reassessed. Further, there is no emergency to make these regulatory changes at this time since any additional bear control would not occur until spring of 2026.

**Recommendations:**

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully recommend that the Board and ADF&G do not reinstate the Mulchatna IM Program targeting the lethal removal of brown and black bears unless it can be scientifically and socially justified after addressing and correcting the scientific problems encountered during the last three years. I strongly recommend that this program be paused until it is re-viewed by an independent committee of scientists to ensure that the program is scientifically sound and includes current population data for both predator and prey. The Mulchatna Caribou Herd population and harvest goals must also be reassessed relative to the carrying capacity of the range. It is unlikely that the goal of maintaining a population of 30,000-80,000 caribou is achievable.

#### Additional Details Regarding the Mulchatna IM Program:

Hinkes et al. (2005, Journal of Wildlife Management) estimated that southwest Alaska Caribou peaked in the early 1860s but declined by the late 1880s and remained low for the next 100 years. They report that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH) grew to about 14,000 by 1974 (the first major census). “The herd grew rapidly during the 1980s and 1990s...estimated at 200,000 animals by 1996.” (Hinkes et al. 2005). Before the irruption of the MCH in the 1980s, the herd was about the size it is today. It is likely that the MCH declined rapidly as a result of declining range conditions, particularly impacts from overgrazing of winter lichens. Some caribou biologists have suggested that it takes many decades for overgrazed lichens to rebound to their former levels. Add to this the impacts of climate change resulting in increased shrubs overtaking lichen habitat.

One of the important recommendations of the National Research Council’s (NRC) 1997 report on Wolves, Bears, and Their Prey in Alaska was “Before any predator management efforts are undertaken,...the carrying capacity of the prey’s environment should be evaluated.” ADF&G has not undertaken any quantitative assessment of carrying capacity of the habitat within the range of the MCH. ADF&G research staff previously reported (Demma & Sattler ADF&G research reports) that caribou cows exhibited nutritional stress. IM progress reports for the Mulchatna herd (Units 9B, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A, 19B, Alaska Department of Fish and Game) allude to nutritional problems among adult caribou and many calf deaths due to malnutrition, dehydration, and “failure to thrive” that are nowhere mentioned in ADF&G reports to the Board. Many Alaska biologists have stated “It is unlikely that the goal of maintaining a populations of 30,000-80,000 caribou is achievable and bear control is unlikely to substantially increase caribou numbers given current nutrition, dis-ease, and illegal harvest issues.” Thus, the current population and harvest objectives are likely unat-tainable and could lead to continued long-term predator control. In fact, the 2024 Mulchatna Cari-bou Herd Photo Survey IM progress report concludes that, “It may be appropriate to consider revis-ing the current population objective of 30,000 to 80,000 given historic and recent population trends.”

Another important recommendation of the NRC (1997) was that “Before any predator control ef-forts are undertaken, the status of the predator and prey populations should be evaluated (including whether they are increasing or decreasing).” The ADF&G has not quantitatively assessed bear populations in the range of the MCH. This is a fundamental flaw of the Mulchatna IM program. This was also a recommendation of ADF&G’s own IM protocol. How can ADF&G and the Board ensure that their management of predators is sustainable if they do not have a scientifically sound population assessment prior to conducting predator control? To date, 186 brown bears have been killed in the Mulchatna intensive management area. Brown bears have the lowest reproductive productivity of any land mammal in North America. Thus, having adequate population data is es-sential to assuring sustainability of management as required by state law.

The NRC (1997) recommendations also included: “ADF&G should broaden the scope of its studies of predator and prey species. It should collect better data on habitat quality and on bear ecology...” Further, the NRC also recommended that “Wolves and bears should be managed using an adaptive management approach in which management actions are planned so that it is possible to assess their outcome.” This approach requires establishing monitoring protocols so that the results of management actions can be scientifically measured. This was not applied in the Mulchatna IM program. There was inadequate experimental design or monitoring established to quantitatively measure the effectiveness of predator control actions.

I was among 34 retired Alaskan wildlife scientists and managers who authored a commentary in the Anchorage Daily News on Aug. 15, 2023. We concluded then that “...there is weak scientific support for the Mulchatna predator control action. The Mulchatna intensive management program has unrealistic population and harvest goals given the history of the herd. It is unlikely that the goal of maintaining a population of 30,000-80,000 caribou is achievable and bear control is unlikely to substantially increase caribou numbers given current nutrition, disease, and illegal harvest issues. Finally, there is a lack of clear criteria for evaluating this intensive management program.” This situation has not changed.

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully recommend that the Board and ADF&G do not reinstate the Mulchatna IM Program targeting the lethal removal of brown and black bears unless it can be scientifically and socially justified after addressing and correcting the scientific problems encountered during the last three years. I strongly recommend that this program be paused until it is re-viewed by an independent committee of scientists to ensure that the program is scientifically sound and includes current population data for both predator and prey. The Mulchatna Caribou Herd population and harvest goals must also be reassessed relative to the carrying capacity of the range.

John W. Schoen, Ph.D.

Wildlife Ecologist, retired

Anchorage, AK



**Name:** Schooler, Lynn

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

Mulchatna proposal / strongly opposed

The proposal to continue the serial killing of bears in an ostensible effort to rejuvenate the Mulchatna herd is unsupportable. The program flies in the face of established facts regarding predator prey relationships, ignores professional

Studies clearly laying the blame for the severe population drop and slow recovery on overgrazed range, and will do nothing to improve that or slow the effects of brucellosis on the caribou. Furthermore, it is contrary to the directive contained within the Alaska State Constitution to manage wildlife in a sustainable manner as a benefit to all citizens of our state. And perhaps most disturbing of all, it is a clear effort to circumvent the express instructions of the court in a manner that borders on contempt. Do not pass this thing.

---



PC1218

**Name:** Schramm, Candace

**Community of Residence:** WA

**Comment:**

This is outrageous and morally wrong!!! Stop the slaughter of these beautiful bears, let them live their lives in peace. All men ever want to do is kill kill, kill...their answer to everything. It's sick and wrong. Wildlife has a tough enough time surviving in the wild, without the treat of man shooting them down from the air or by land. No baby bear deserves to have his mama die, leaving him/her to be killed by other predators. If man wants so badly to take the life of a bear, let him go one on one with the bear, no weapons, just their hands...same as a bear. Now that's a fair fight in my eyes. Please stop this insanity!!!

---



PC1219

**Name:** Schuler, Jennifer

**Community of Residence:** Travis county

**Comment:**

I am against the proposed plan of management of the caribou herd by gunning down brown and black bears by helicopter. There is no evidence backing up the regrowth of the caribou population by doing so, no scientific facts or figures to support this. It's wrong to gun down from a man made vantage an apex predator in its natural habitat just because it exists.

---



PC1220

**Name:** Schultz , Sarah

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

I oppose this measure. Our summer tourism and economy depend on the bears. They live harmoniously with us and are an integral part of our ecosystem. Please do not mess with nature and start shooting them!

---



PC1221

**Name:** Schultz, Ava

**Community of Residence:** Beaumont, AB, Canada

**Comment:**

I am against the hunting of bears in support of protecting caribou herds. There is no scientific evidence that removing predators, such as black bears and brown bears, benefits caribou herds populations. I also believe it is unethical and inhumane to shoot and kill bears with cubs.

---



**Name:** Schwab, Dieter

**Community of Residence:** Australia

**Comment:**

Concerned citizen from Australia. Stop this genocide

---



**Name:** Schwalm, Heather

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

Please do not kill the bears they are integral to the ecosystem. They have not been proven to hurt the Elk population. This is not the way to correct anything. Please do not kill the bears!!!!

---



**Name:** Scott, Sarah

**Community of Residence:** ID

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd.

As it stands, there is no credible scientific evidence in the record to support the conclusion that Mulchatna bears can be killed sustainably.

There is also overwhelming evidence that predator control programs do not work to recover struggling moose and caribou populations. Per the State's own

esearch, the main reasons for the  
Mulchatna caribou herd decline are  
disease and a lack of food (due to  
climate change), not bear  
predation.

I want Mulchatna caribou to  
succeed, but I don't believe the  
current, unlawful bear control  
program IS the best way to help them.

If the Boara of Game wishes to  
make significant changes to this  
area, then it is critical to ensure that  
the decisions are rooted both in  
credible science and what the  
people decide.

---



**Name:** Sears, Ash

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

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd.

As it stands, there is no credible scientific evidence in the record to support the conclusion that Mulchatna bears can be killed sustainably.

There is also overwhelming evidence that predator control programs do not work to recover struggling moose and caribou populations. Per the State's own research, the main reasons for the Mulchatna caribou herd decline are disease and a lack of food (due to climate change), not bear predation.

I want Mulchatna caribou to succeed, but I don't believe the current, unlawful bear control program is the best way to help them.

If the Board of Game wishes to make significant changes to this area, then it is critical to ensure that the decisions are rooted both in credible science and what the people decide.

---



**Name:** Sears, Nikolai

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

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd.

As it stands, there is no credible scientific evidence in the record to support the conclusion that Mulchatna bears can be killed sustainably.

There is also overwhelming evidence that predator control programs do not work to recover struggling moose and caribou populations. Per the State's own research, the main reasons for the Mulchatna caribou herd decline are disease and a lack of food (due to climate change), not bear predation.

I want Mulchatna caribou to succeed, but I don't believe the current, unlawful bear control program is the best way to help them.

If the Board of Game wishes to make significant changes to this area, then it is critical to ensure that the decisions are rooted both in credible science and what the people decide.

---



**Name:** Seeds, Sarah

**Community of Residence:** New York City

**Comment:**

To do this is inhumane, and not backed by science. No need to kill these bears.

---



**Name:** Segal, Ellen

**Community of Residence:** Canmore, BC

**Comment:**

I very strongly oppose any taxpayer-funded barbaric aerial gunning programs by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game modifying the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area and planning to kill Katmai & Southwest Alaska Bears, including essential mother's with cubs of Brown Bears and Black Bears which is particularly inhumane and disruptive!!! I also oppose using hunting, trapping, snaring, snow mobile killing any of these Bears and Wolves!

Why are you holding new board hearings when this program was developed behind closed doors, and the public did not have a chance to comment before it was passed? The public opposition has been extensive, so, by using the "emergency regulation" you bypass the public who pay for these killings when that is not what they want?

When you killed the Bears & Wolves in the second and principal period from May 10 to June 5 of 2024 you left Bear meat on the ground, which is a sacrilege. The local community did not want Bear meat and you killed Wolves when they were not in peak season so no Wolf hides were salvaged.....and yet this is

sustainable & scientific and over \$415,000 of state money was allocated for the planned spring predator control program?

Your plan is flawed with copious ethical concerns, and potential threats to other nearby Bear populations-particularly around Katmai.

Where is the robust science, PUBLIC INPUT & DUE PROCESS before any predator control continues?

You're disrupting natural ecosystems and you lack baseline data on Bear populations and uncertain sustainability!!! These are a protected species for a reason! The problem is not rooted in keystone predators, the problem is rooted in disease and climate change/global warming affecting habitats, food sources diminishing thus depriving female Caribou and Moose of adequate nutrition which can negatively affect the survival of their off spring.

A court (Judge Guide) in March of this year, 2025, ruled this program unconstitutional-saying it violated public process and lacked proper Bear population data!

For ADF&G to respond by pushing an "emergency regulation" to resume aerial control in the spring of 12025, despite the court's voiding the program is illegal and WRONG! The people do not want our great Bears sniper killed, and treated like vermin when they are a protected species!

It's important that you recognize the in May 2025 Judge Rankin issued a temporary restraining order, citing ADF&G's "bad faith" the State acted in bad faith, the Emergency Regulation was passed, it is invalid and without legal effect,, further, the Board's actions are not in compliance with the March court order and again halting aerial gunning after eleven more great Bears were killed.

Katmai & Southwest Alaska Bears are in danger with this unsustainable and unscientific approach. Bears in the Mulchatna range often migrate through neighboring areas like Katmai NP and Wood-Tikchik State Park.

Your actions may impact these great Bear societies and harm the broader Bear ecosystem and tourism in Katmai! These Bears are iconic and you're plan treats them as inconvenient vermin.

In closing~ADF&G's aerial predator control has faced strong legal and scientific challenges due to:

Procedural deficiencies and insufficient ecological data.

Continued Bear kills despite court injunctions.

Widespread condemnation from experts, environmental groups, and local communities.

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility-senior ecologists calling the methods "barbaric" and "unsupported:".

Retired ADF&G biologists (e.g., Ken Whitten, Jim Dau)-highlight nutrition, disease, and climate as primary drivers, not predation.

Public opinion & petitions -labeling aerial gunning as inhumane and urging science-first policies.

Please stop this ill conceived and destructive plan now.

---



**Name:** Segrin, Kim

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

Please do not support the mass slaughter of bears in Alaska. Let nature be nature!

---



**Name:** Seibel , Beth

**Community of Residence:** Pittsburgh, PA

**Comment:**

The idea to gun down innocent and beautiful wildlife in our country is barbaric and lazy. Yes, lazy. You could partner with legitimate wildlife protection organizations to find non-lethal means to manage wildlife and land. Instead, the call is always for savagery and killing. I vehemently oppose this brutality and DO NOT want my tax dollars supporting such evil. Do better...its possible. Thank you.

---



**Name:** Selby, Dena

**Community of Residence:** Haines, AK

**Comment:**

Please do NOT make a regulation change to instate bear predator control in the Mulchatna region of southwest Alaska. That area is just 30 miles from the border of Katmai National Park and 3 miles from Lake Clark National Preserve.

Brown bears have home ranges up to 50 - 195 square miles. Collaring projects in Lake Clark from 2014 to 2018 show bears moving into the proposed control area from the safe havens of the National Preserve.

I just returned from a trip to McNeil River and had an unforgettable experience. This is due to careful regulation of human activity in that area, which has allowed bears to accept a small cadre of humans in their space. If they begin associating bear deaths with humans, what has taken 40+ years to create will be mute.

Let Mother Nature rule, not mislead humans.

---



PC1232

**Name:** Selthun, Pam

**Community of Residence:** Arizona

**Comment:**

I am opposed to The Board of Game's proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd. There is no scientific evidence for the claim that fewer predators, and particularly less black and brown bears, results in larger Caribou herds. Please do not resume the aerial shooting of bears. Thank you.

---



PC1233

**Name:** Selvatico, Daniela

**Community of Residence:** Italy

**Comment:**

Men should never interfere with nature skills in balancing populations on earth because we know nothing and we count nothing in the economy of the universe. We simply are too proud to acknowledge it.

---



PC1234

**Name:** Semoni, Anthony

**Community of Residence:** Cedar county

**Comment:**

The Bears should be shot with the camera only, if there is a hunting season that's a different story, but to just kill them no let them be. Should a bear attack a human I understand the reasoning behind

---



PC1235

**Name:** Sen, Riya

**Community of Residence:** India

**Comment:**

Please don't do this to the bears

---



PC1236

**Name:** Serrano, Valerie.

**Community of Residence:** [REDACTED] LA, CA 90008

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd. I am an active USA voter. Please do not kill wildlife.

I strongly oppose the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd. There's no scientific evidence it would be beneficial. Please, do not kill wildlife. We must protect wild animals not kill. This is Alaska after all. Do better. I am from Los Angeles, California and visited Anchorage with family a couple of years back. We were drawn to visit to view wildlife. We would like to go again. If this passes, we will not forget it and you can forget counting on our tourism money.

---



PC1237

**Name:** Sesto, Mary

**Community of Residence:** DeForest

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed Mulchatna bear control program. I have had the opportunity to visit Katmai and see Alaskan grizzlies. I am thankful for that opportunity and hope to return with family but I can't do so if the bears are being indiscriminately killed.

I have significant concerns about the potential negative effects on bear populations, including the bears at Katmai National Park which inhabit some of the same areas part of the year. Research is needed to understand the implications of killing of these bears and the impact on the ecosystem. Not to mention the ethical concerns related to these actions.

---



PC1238

**Name:** Shah, Vini

**Community of Residence:** India

**Comment:**

Save the bears

---



PC1239

**Name:** Shaikh, Salim

**Community of Residence:** Protect Wildlife

**Comment:**

Pls stop this killing!!! Period

---



**Name:** Sharma, Monika

**Community of Residence:** Slovakia

**Comment:**

I will always Stand with animals ,we are not wort to have these beautiful creatures

---



**Name:** Sharma, Shailaja

**Community of Residence:** Pune, india

**Comment:**

We have stolen their homes, children, polluted the rivers we share with them, grabbed their food and now propose to kill them, citing lack of space and resources. If there is one species which needs to self reflect and curb their population- it's humans.

---



**Name:** Shaw, Ashley

**Community of Residence:** Peru Illinois

**Comment:**

All animals matter and are important

---



**Name:** Sherma, Kayla

**Community of Residence:** Maine

**Comment:**

Please stop killing the bears!!!

---



**Name:** Sherwonit, Bill

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, Alaska

**Comment:**

OPPOSE

We have been down this path before. And, as before, I wish to express my STRONG AND WHOLEHEARTED OPPOSITION to this proposed regulation or any other "intensive management" or bear-kill actions that (in the state's words) would purportedly "benefit" the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

Based on past experience, the Alaska Board of Game (BOG) will rationalize its way to approving this proposed regulation by the Department of Fish and Game (F&G), which continues a bear (and wolf) kill effort that is a travesty from any number of perspectives, among them economic, biological, and ethical.

I have shared my observations and opinions with the board—and the larger public—on previous occasions, so I won't go into great length here. But I will emphasize and reiterate several key points that the BOG has chosen to ignore or dismiss in the past and will be asked to consider once again.

To begin, this IM kill of bears (the large majority of them brown bears) makes no biological sense. The department's own researchers have concluded that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd's dramatic decline over the past couple of decades has resulted from several factors. These include changing habitat conditions in the herd's range, at least partly tied to climate change, that have resulted in the diminished availability of foods that the caribou need to survive. At the same time, it's possible, perhaps likely, that the herd overgrazed its range when it numbered 200,000 animals (or thereabouts), far above the long-term average, thus also diminishing available foods. This has happened to caribou herds across the state over time, resulting in cyclical highs and lows, and is likely happening right now in Arctic Alaska and elsewhere. It's my understanding that state researchers also pinpointed brucellosis as a likely factor in the herd's decline, as well as human overhunting (including some illegal hunting). Predation by bears (and wolves) has not been identified as a significant factor in the herd's decline nor in its failure to "rebound" substantially. The herd faces much bigger challenges than bears or wolves.

In short, brown (and black) bears never should have been targeted by the state in an IM program.

Not surprisingly, F&G staff have determined that their aerial slaughter of nearly 200 bears since 2023 has improved caribou calf survival that it links to the state-run bear kill. But it must be recognized that the department has a vested interest in seeing such success, even when the evidence shows otherwise. Several independent biologists—some of them former F&G employees—have made a strong case, using F&G's own data, that there is no evidence that the kill of so many bears has significantly improved calf survival. I defer to those independent biologists outside F&G, who will present their findings and interpretations to the board.

At least two other factors need to be considered by the BOG in assessing the state's newly proposed regulation. First, it's my understanding that F&G has failed to adequately address the question of "sustained yield," as it applies to the brown bear population the state is determined to "control." This is a key question. It shouldn't be necessary to remind the board that this was one of the critical issues that prompted two Alaska judges to rule against the state's Mulchatna bear-kill program in 2025. I hope that the BOG will press this issue and require F&G staff to show it has adequately addressed the questions raised by Alaska judicial system. Second, biologists outside the department have questioned whether F&G's "target" size for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, of 30,000 to 80,000 animals is realistic. It may be that current and future range conditions will only support a much smaller herd. This too needs to be adequately addressed by the board, because it figures into F&G's rationale for killing bears (and wolves).

Though others will address the question of economics in more detail, I will point out that many opponents of the "Mulchatna bear massacre" are incredulous that the state is willing to spend so much money to kill these bears, particularly when there's no sure evidence that this aerial slaughter is going to make any substantial difference in the caribou herd's recovery. The numbers I've seen total nearly \$1 million for 2023-2024—not including the costs for staff involved in the program, or the legal costs of defending the state's unlawful actions. It's not clear to me how much of the cost is paid by the "Intensive Management Fund" the state has devised for its predator control programs, but surely questions have to be raised about the

economic costs of this IM program, during a time of significant Alaska “budget shortfalls.” I hope all of this will be considered in depth as well.

Finally, there is the question of ethics. F&G administrators have assured the public that the aerial kill of Mulchatna bears—including mothers and their cubs—has been done humanely. I find it hard to believe that the use of helicopters to chase bears, including families of bears, and then kill them, can be considered humane by any stretch of the imagination. If F&G has evidence that the killing of these bears has been done humanely, I would ask that it share such evidence. That bears would be terrorized and killed in the hope that their suffering might boost Mulchatna caribou numbers is another aspect of this program that in my mind makes the state’s actions reprehensible and all those participating in the slaughter—or approving it—should be ashamed.

Bill Sherwonit, Anchorage

---



**Name:** Shinn, Lisa

**Community of Residence:** Pa

**Comment:**

I am adamantly against the aerial murdering of any animal!!! These bears are watched on explore.org by hundreds of thousands of people around the world who may never get the opportunity to travel to Alaska to see them in person. They have personalities, are individuals with storied pasts & are identified by those that follow them year in year out through all of their challenges to survive.....all the ups & downs thrown at them and do not deserve to be slaughtered by a species that is destroying everything they touch & thinks it knows best how to manage the other species when we can't even manage our own!!!

THE GREATNESS OF A NATION AND ITS MORAL PROGRESS CAN BE JUDGED BY THE WAY ITS ANIMALS ARE TREATED....Gandhi

No truer words have been spoken. I implore you to not go through with the aerial murder of ANY species!!! It is evil, cruel & barbaric!!!

---



**Name:** Shirazi, Fatima

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

What an awful thing to be reading, we already don't take care our of wildlife. Please have some mercy and a conscience. This isn't ok, it's never ok.

---



**Name:** Shirley, Jill

**Community of Residence:** Saskatoon

**Comment:**

I am so disappointed to hear in the decision to harm so much wildlife. Canada is better than this.

---



**Name:** Shockey , Jenna

**Community of Residence:** Hillsboro, OR

**Comment:**

Stop the innocent slaughter of wildlife

---



**Name:** Shomo, Diane

**Community of Residence:** Michigan

**Comment:**

I oppose this unnecessary slaughter of bears. As a wildlife enthusiast and photographer, I have spent thousands of dollars to spend time in the wilderness. It is this kind of ill-advised mismanagement that keeps me from traveling to Alaska, I place I dearly would like to visit before I die.and since I am at high risk of my cancer metastasizing, that doesn't give me a lot of time. I plead with you, please do not make every interaction between humans and wild animals one that diminishes the latter.

---



**Name:** Siebert, Cindy

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

I do not pay taxes for you to murder bears. Learn to coexist with them and provide the public with appropriate resources and education on how to interact with bears safely. We must also learn how to protect ourselves by educating ourselves on how to coexist with wildlife. It is UNNECESSARY to kill and depopulate endangered bear populations. Hold the people accountable for their actions of killing bears NOW.

---



**Name:** Sierra, Kuulei

**Community of Residence:** Eagle River, AK

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the culling of bears in the Mulchatna caribou herd management area. There is not data to support such a practice. The graphs clearly show that even after taking out other predators like wolves, starting in 2017, the herd continues to decline. I have a strong bond to the bears in Katmai National Park, having visited Brooks Falls in 2023, 2024, and next weekend. I also watch them for hours each day on the explore.org cameras. I get immense satisfaction seeing how they go about their daily lives and learning how they navigate the incredible difficulties of raising cubs and trying to find enough food to just survive another year. The bears who live in the national park could also be spending time in herd management area. I would hate to think of some of the bears I have seen being shot from a helicopter, without sufficient studies to show that it will positively impact the herd.

---



**Name:** Sigwart, Kimberlee

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I am writing because I strongly oppose Alaska's predator control program, particularly the killing of bears (and wolves) under the justification of increasing moose and caribou populations for hunting. This practice is inhumane, ecologically destructive, and scientifically unsound. Both bears and wolves are vital apex predators that maintain balance in the ecosystem. Their removal causes a ripple effect that harms the natural biodiversity Alaska is known for. Instead of killing these iconic animals, plans to invest in science-based wildlife management that respects the integrity of Alaska's ecosystems should be considered! Predator control is a short-sighted solution to a complex issue, and it ultimately harms the environment, wildlife tourism, and the global image of Alaska as a place of wild beauty and ecological responsibility. Please end the program and protect Alaska's bears for future generations.

---



**Name:** Sills, Rebecca

**Community of Residence:** Tucson, AZ

**Comment:**

This letter expresses strong opposition to the herding and killing of brown and black bears in Alaska. This practice is often part of predator control programs designed to increase populations of other species like caribou and moose.

The use of lethal methods, such as aerial gunning, may be unethical, potentially ineffective, and detrimental to the broader ecosystem. Bears are crucial for maintaining ecological balance, and their removal can have effects on biodiversity and habitat stability.

There are concerns about the legal and ethical implications of these practices. Recent court rulings have questioned Alaska's adherence to its constitutional provisions regarding sustained yield and public trust in wildlife management, as well as due process. Continuing these programs despite the law and public opposition is troubling.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game are urged to suspend the Intensive Management Program and similar initiatives that involve the herding and killing of black bears. Science-based, non-lethal solutions that address the root causes of prey population decline while protecting Alaska's natural heritage are encouraged instead.

Practices like aerial gunning tarnish the state's image as a responsible steward of its natural resources.

It is hoped that a responsible decision will be made to protect Alaska's black bears and uphold the integrity of the state's wildlife management policies. Please do not pass this and allow myself and those like me to enjoy these animals in wild areas for years to come.

---

**Name:** Silva, Patricia



**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

Please all bears alone, adult and baby bears..

---

**Name:** Simard, Linda



**Community of Residence:** Po Box 31 Stn Main

**Comment:**

I read about your horrific plan to snuff out the bears. The war on animals has got to end. We do not have the right to do this to another species sharing our planet. I think it is actually not ethical even though it may be legal. Shame on anyone involved. I 100% oppose.

---

**Name:** Simonis, Evan



**Community of Residence:** Alexandria Ohio

**Comment:**

Oppose, nature does not need human intervention. Let it take its course like it has for 1,000's of years.

---



**Name:** Sims, Crystal

**Community of Residence:** Georgia

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this sorry of culling of predators, especially bears, without first determining the actual causes of caribou decline. For instance, is it due to decreased habitat, changing climate, disease or is it predation by bears?

If the latter, are there specific bears who are the problem or is it a wide population of bears doing the predation?

I support necessary culling of over populated soecies when they are shown to be causing dangerous declines of other vital animal species. However, it does not seem that the necessary investigation has been done to justify this extreme solution.

---



**Name:** Sindon, Antibiotics

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I absolutely oppose this bill! These animals have a right to survive in their own habitat. Hunting them down by helicopter and not even giving them a chance is absolutely tragic and this needs to stop.

My reasoning is because it's wrong, it is not OK to take the life of a healthy animal.

The same way God made us God made them and they have every right to be here too. Every life matters.

---



**Name:** Siner, Ann

**Community of Residence:** Paradise Valley, AZ

**Comment:**

Alaska is one of the most special places on earth, in part because of its wildlife and its "wild-ness". Let's face it, bears and other major predators have existed for thousands of years without "government" interference. The thought of gunning down any animal is absolutely sickening and if this happens, I won't be going to Alaska again. Please have some compassion for the animals and for those of us that fight for them. Thank you for listening.

---



**Name:** Singh, Arpita

**Community of Residence:** Krishna Puri Road Mohru Nagar

**Comment:**

Save the bears

---



**Name:** Singh, Prathamjit

**Community of Residence:** Delhi

**Comment:**

please stop the bear killings it's unethical they're innocent souls

---



**Name:** Singh, Sherrie

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Stop slaughtering the bears

---



**Name:** Singh, Shreyash

**Community of Residence:** Virar, Maharashtra

**Comment:**

The world needs to understand Every species relies on one another stop the worthless killing

---



**Name:** Singh, Simray

**Community of Residence:** London

**Comment:**

This has to be stopped there's no need for this please leave them alone they're hurting no one.

---



PC1265

**Name:** Skelton, Niamh

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Stop the brutal slaughter of bears. There is absolutely no scientific evidence that this will help the caribou populations.

---



PC1266

**Name:** Skiles, Katherine

**Community of Residence:** Plano, Texas

**Comment:**

Dear Members of the Board of Game,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment that would allow department staff to kill brown and black bears in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area, under the justification of benefiting the caribou population.

This proposal is deeply troubling on both ethical and scientific grounds. Targeting bears — including mothers with cubs and older males — indiscriminately, and by shooting them from helicopters, is an inhumane and deeply irresponsible method of wildlife management.

These types of predator control efforts are not only ineffective but may also disrupt the ecosystem in unintended and irreversible ways. There is little to no conclusive evidence that killing bears in this manner will lead to a meaningful or sustainable recovery of the caribou herd. Research has shown that eagles actually kill more caribou calves than bears do. Instead of relying on outdated and brutal tactics, I urge the Board to invest in evidence-based, ecologically sound approaches that address the root causes of caribou decline — including habitat degradation, climate change, and human activity.

We have a responsibility to manage wildlife populations with compassion, wisdom, and science — not by resorting to widespread killing of apex predators. I respectfully urge you to reject this proposal and seek solutions that honor both scientific integrity and humane values.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---



PC1267

**Name:** Skurtys, Zuzanna

**Community of Residence:** 69a Warner Road

**Comment:**

The fact this is even considered is fucking appalling - we destroy their habitat and ruin their ecosystems make this planet less inhabitable by the year and now on top killing them from helicopters so that bored rich fat men can find entertainment, is a consideration??? How can you sleep at night.

---



PC1268

**Name:** Slattery, Julie

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Stop the violence!! Stop murdering innocent animals!!! Save the bears!

---



PC1269

**Name:** Slay, Heidi

**Community of Residence:** MI

**Comment:**

Stop killing these bears & they're babies

---



PC1270

**Name:** Sloan, Hallie

**Community of Residence:** Seattle, WA

**Comment:**

I oppose. 5 AAC 92.111. Intensive Management Plans I. It's inhumane to shoot bears from helicopters, and unnecessary.

---



PC1271

**Name:** Slonaker, Lynn

**Community of Residence:** Pawling, NY

**Comment:**

What is wrong with our country that we think we need to control everything? Have we not learned from any of our mistakes? Just stop!!

---



PC1272

**Name:** Smith , Caroline

**Community of Residence:** New jersey

**Comment:**

The proposal to hunt bears aerially just a few miles from a national park is absolutely preposterous. Hunting bears at all is a preposterous, ludicrous suggestion, but especially from aircraft. There are very few ways to ensure the safety of hikers and other species when hunting is done this way. Furthermore, it endangers a vulnerable population of predators in an ecosystem which ought to be protected to the fullest extent of the law. The hunting of bear is not for food, but for recreation. It is not necessary for the preservation of human life and therefore it's just not permissible legally, ethically, or morally. It's a disgusting proposition.

---



**Name:** Smith , Kaitlin

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the policy of killing brown bears in Alaska under the justification of protecting caribou populations. This approach is not only ethically troubling, but also ecologically short-sighted.

Brown bears play a vital role in maintaining a healthy ecosystem. Targeted predator control like this ignores the natural balance that has existed for millennia. Scientific research consistently shows that such interventions often fail to produce the intended outcomes and can even backfire by destabilizing ecosystems and causing ripple effects across species.

Furthermore, using lethal methods to manipulate wildlife populations for human-centered goals—such as boosting caribou numbers for hunting—is a dangerous precedent. Wildlife management should be rooted in science, respect for nature, and long-term sustainability—not short-term interests or pressure from special interest groups.

There are better, non-lethal, and more ecologically sound ways to support caribou populations—such as habitat restoration, limiting human disturbance, and addressing climate change.

Alaska’s wild landscapes and the species that inhabit them deserve thoughtful, science-based stewardship—not misguided predator eradication.

---



**Name:** Smith Isgar, Lillian

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Don’t kill animals if you think something’s overpopulated its people. Why the hell are we killing bears instead of committing suicide?

---



**Name:** Smith, Abriana

**Community of Residence:** Phoenix, AZ

**Comment:**

I Stand in Firm Opposition to Alaska’s Intensive Management Policy for the Mulchatna Caribou: A Statement from a Concerned and Ethical Visitor

As an avid traveler, a supporter of ethical wildlife tourism, and someone who has long admired Alaska for its natural grandeur, I write to express my profound opposition to the state’s current approach to wildlife management, specifically, the proposal to intensively manage predators in the region of the Mulchatna caribou herd. Let me be absolutely clear: I do not and will not support a state that engages in the

unnecessary and politically motivated killing of wildlife, particularly apex predators, in the absence of clear scientific justification.

I have always regarded Alaska as a symbol of wild integrity, a land where the ecosystems remain largely intact, where nature governs itself, and where wildlife still roams in a balance that has been shaped over millennia. However, the recent proposal to conduct large-scale lethal removal of bears and wolves under the banner of “intensive management” is a betrayal of that ideal. It undermines the ecological values that draw millions of visitors, including myself, to Alaska each year. And it is a policy I cannot, in good conscience, support through tourism, spending, or silence.

The decline of the Mulchatna caribou herd is a serious concern, but the root causes have been clearly documented by biologists and wildlife experts: climate variability, habitat degradation, disease, and human overharvest. These are complex, long-term pressures, and yet, Alaska’s response is to shift the blame onto predators and authorize their mass removal. This is not science-based management. It is scapegoating, and it is deeply unethical.

There is no compelling scientific evidence to support the notion that killing bears and wolves will lead to a sustained rebound in caribou numbers. On the contrary, predator control efforts of this scale have often resulted in ecological imbalances, unintended consequences, and, ultimately, failure. The natural systems in which caribou, bears, and wolves coexist are not simple predator-prey equations to be manipulated at will. They are intricate, adaptive webs of life, and disrupting them through aggressive intervention is not only irresponsible — it is dangerous.

Furthermore, this type of policy alienates a growing demographic of visitors who travel not to hunt, but to witness Alaska’s remarkable wildlife in its natural setting. The bear watching industry alone brings in tens of millions of dollars annually, supporting rural economies and promoting a vision of Alaska as a leader in wildlife conservation. Decisions that prioritize a narrow hunting interest over broader public values are economically shortsighted, environmentally reckless, and socially tone-deaf.

I do not oppose hunting. Ethical, regulated, subsistence-based hunting is a longstanding and important tradition in Alaska, one that I respect. What I oppose — unequivocally — is the wholesale removal of predators from the landscape to artificially inflate game populations for human harvest. That is not conservation. It is manipulation, and it is morally unacceptable.

When the state authorizes the aerial gunning of bears, the trapping of wolves, and the widespread disruption of intact predator populations, it sends a clear message: that wildlife exists primarily to serve human desires, not as part of a greater ecological whole. It tells visitors like me that the values of dominance and exploitation prevail over those of stewardship, humility, and restraint. And it makes clear that Alaska’s reputation as a global leader in wildlife management is under serious threat.

I will not support this direction. Until these practices are halted and replaced with science-based, ecologically literate, and ethically sound wildlife management policies, I will withhold my tourism dollars, my recommendations to others, and my support for the state. I will not travel to a place that treats iconic, sentient, ecologically vital species as expendable obstacles to political expediency.

Instead, I will lend my voice and resources to conservation organizations working to protect Alaska’s predators. I will write to lawmakers, speak to fellow travelers, and continue advocating for a more ethical and enlightened approach to managing the state’s incredible natural resources.

Alaska has an opportunity to lead, to model a vision of wildlife conservation that respects ecological complexity, values all species, and recognizes that we are not separate from nature, but part of it. That is

the Alaska I believed in. That is the Alaska the world wants to see. And that is the Alaska I hope to return to — once this misguided and destructive policy is reversed.

Until then, I will not return.

---



**Name:** Smith, Alecia

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose shooting and killing the Mulchatna bears. I have spent my entire life dreaming about coming here to see bears. I will not stand by and allow them to be shot in cold blood when the Caribou population is doing just fine. If anything maybe humans should hunt less caribou to help the population reset but brown bears are absolutely the problem. This state survives on tourism. A lot of people come here to view wildlife. Leave the mulchatna bears alone!!

---



**Name:** Smith, Caroline

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

The land was the bears land first. This fact alone is reason for them to live and not be murdered by humans encroaching on their land. Killing the cubs impedes on their existence. It is unethical and was also deemed illegal by the courts last year. What is the purpose of the mass slaughter? Bears do not go out of their way to harm people and they are omnivores. They do not hunt prey generally. Please stop killing innocent bears for no logical reason. Every life is precious. Do not forget your humanity with thinking life is not precious.

---



**Name:** Smith, Denelle

**Community of Residence:** Little River

**Comment:**

The bears have a right to the forest and river where they live. You should be protecting them, not shooting them. The action of shooting them is a disgrace.

---



**Name:** Smith, Helen

**Community of Residence:** 7 The Drove

**Comment:**

Please let the wildlife live their life as we having taken away sooooo much of their habitat and they were around first. The in themselves are a tourist attraction which should satisfy the money men!

---



**Name:** Smith, Jenna

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

Save the bears. There is no need to kill the beautiful animals for the fun of humans. It is despicable.

---



**Name:** Smith, Nay

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

all wildlife deserve to live in their natural habitats without human interference especially if that interference is resulting in slaughtering.

---



**Name:** Sneddon, Laura

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

**Comment:**

To the Members of the Alaska Board of Game:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the continued implementation of the Mulchatna bear control program and the practice of aerially gunning bears from helicopters. The current approach is not only scientifically unsound but also represents a fundamental violation of Alaska's legal processes and ethical wildlife management principles.

The scientific evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that predator control programs do not effectively recover struggling ungulate populations. Research conducted by the State's own biologists in 2020 identified the primary causes of the Mulchatna caribou herd's decline as disease (particularly brucellosis) and habitat loss due to climate change, not predation. Bear predation is not even among the top three identified causes of mortality in the herd. In fact, studies including research on moose harvests in GMU 13 and wolf predation on the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd have shown that reducing predators does not lead to increased ungulate populations. The data from the original wolf control program supports this conclusion—250 wolves were killed by 2017, yet the caribou herd continued its rapid decline during the

same period. The current program's own mortality data from 2024 reveals that 69% of monitored calf deaths resulted from starvation or dehydration, not predation, further undermining the rationale for bear control.

The legal and procedural violations surrounding this program are deeply troubling and undermine public trust in Alaska's wildlife management system. Two separate judges have ruled the bear control program "unlawfully adopted" and "void and without legal effect," yet the State has continued operations in direct defiance of court orders. The Superior Court noted that the State acted in "bad faith" by implementing an emergency regulation designed to circumvent judicial rulings, stating that "compliance was not the goal of the Emergency regulation—continuing predator control by any means was the goal." This program was developed behind closed doors without the required public, biological, or fiscal review, denying Alaskans their right to participate in wildlife management decisions. The Board's pattern of deliberating in closed sessions and rewriting proposals without public input represents a fundamental violation of the democratic process that should govern natural resource management.

The scale and ethics of this program are unprecedented and indefensible. In just two years, State gunners have killed 175 brown bears from helicopters, including cubs and nursing mothers, across nearly 3,000 square miles of pristine habitat that includes Wood-Tikchik State Park—created specifically to protect the area's fish and wildlife. The program's operational plan callously mandates killing "every bear, regardless of age or sex" within the control area, including the tragic deaths of 20 cubs in 2023 alone. This indiscriminate slaughter has drawn condemnation from 34 retired Alaska wildlife scientists and managers, former governors, and former ADFG commissioners, all of whom recognize the program as scientifically unjustified and ethically indefensible.

I urge the Board of Game to immediately discontinue the Mulchatna bear control program and redirect resources toward evidence-based conservation strategies that address the actual causes of the caribou herd's decline. Rather than continuing this costly and ineffective program—which has consumed over \$500,000 in state funds annually—Alaska should focus on disease management, habitat restoration, and climate adaptation strategies that offer genuine hope for the Mulchatna herd's recovery. The bears of southwest Alaska deserve protection, not persecution, and the people of Alaska deserve wildlife management based on science, law, and ethical principles rather than political expedience.

Thank you for your consideration of these critical concerns.

---

**Name:** Soares, Anela Whittney

**Community of Residence:** B 2

**Comment:**

Culturally as a Native this isn't our way. This doesn't respect our way or give any hope for a future of this land and our people. We could work towards a better solution that gives input for cultural sensitivity and respect. Instead of this killings that's outraging thousands of us natives and non natives. I humble and seriously ask of you to consider what we are saying and come to the table of compromise to discuss a better solution for all.

---





PC1284

**Name:** Sobianina, Katrina

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

Please stop killing these bears. They are part of the natural ecosystem. The killing is brutal, cruel and outdated. Stop!

---



PC1285

**Name:** Sobity , Al

**Community of Residence:** Missouri

**Comment:**

I support the right if bears and I believe that nature is going to be okay without the involvement of people they are part of this planet just like any other species.

Thank you

---



PC1286

**Name:** Solis, Alison

**Community of Residence:** Unsure

**Comment:**

Do not cause war on wildlife and believe you know better than creator. We are responsible for all life and it is especially the leaders responsibilities to uphold safety for all species. If you threaten them or any species you threaten us all.

---



PC1287

**Name:** Solis, Kasandra

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

They deserve to live just like any other being. We as humans are the reason why animals go to extinction. We need to let them live their lives in their land free from harm from humans. Instead of hunting them, we should be protecting them

---



PC1288

**Name:** Song, Robin

**Community of Residence:** Talkeetna

**Comment:**

I am in opposition to the proposed regulated changes to 5AAC 92, 111 by the ADF&G

which would allow the killing of black and brown Bears in Mulchatna. This is illegal, as these Bears are constitutionally protected. It is also completely unacceptable and unnecessary.

Leave these protected Bears alone!!!

---



PC1289

**Name:** Sonthar Lingam, Shevane

**Community of Residence:** Malaysian

**Comment:**

Animals are not to be stripped off their basix right - which is to live peacefully in this Earth! We humans, are supposed to learn how to share this planet with them and not just go on a killing spree. Are we that brutal and heartless to kill these bears?? PLEASE SHOW SOME COMPASSION AND DO BETTER!

---



PC1290

**Name:** Sorbo, Amber

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

Please stop killing the bears! This is unneeded and terrorizing! Absolutely appalling

---



PC1291

**Name:** Soucy, Karen

**Community of Residence:** Lynnwood Washington

**Comment:**

I implore those who read these comments to listen to us. Bears are not what put hunting "game" at risk. They are just trying to eat to survive, in like human kind who kill for sport and trophies. What is putting these animals at risk is deforestation and destruction of habitats across Alaska and the entire world. If you want to protect hunting prey, protect their homes. Killing more animals in order to be able to kill more of another type of animal is just atrocious. When will the death be enough? What we call governing has turned into callous and self righteous. You deem acts legal and pretend that actually makes it ok. We put human sport over the life of any other species. Please govern with your heart and soul instead. Realize that bears deserve to eat and to live. Realize that humans should not be entitled to decide who lives and who dies indiscriminately. I beg you to stop the bear slaughter.

---



**Name:** Spalter , Diane

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Please, let nature and the natural world alone!

We do not need to interfere in the process.

It is wrong and cruel!

No, just NO!!!!

---



**Name:** Sparke, Susan

**Community of Residence:** Nevada state

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the killing of bears, especially in the spring as some may be trailing cubs which would be left behind to die.

---



**Name:** Spencer, Heather

**Community of Residence:** East Tennessee

**Comment:**

It is cruel and inhumane to shoot bears and cubs from helicopters.

---



**Name:** Spice, Charley Lauren

**Community of Residence:** Nottingham

**Comment:**

There is no valid proof to show that killing bears increases the preys population. There are too many factors involved for this to be the only solution.

---



**Name:** Spice, Pat

**Community of Residence:** Sioux Lookout

**Comment:**

Killing wild life should never be condoned, culling is just humanity interfering in the natural processes. All too often we use culling methods without research that it is effective or needed. Nature will create a balance on its own we need to stand back and stop jumping to unsupported conclusions that culling works. Caribou can travel further and faster than bears in order to protect the herd. If anything humans need to stop infringing on bear habitat so they don't need to spread further out to feed and survive.

---



**Name:** Spiegel, Suzanne

**Community of Residence:** Kodiak

**Comment:**

Killing brown bears to “control the predator population” is not only unethical—it’s ecologically reckless. Brown bears are keystone species whose presence supports the health and balance of entire ecosystems. Their role in dispersing seeds, enriching soil with salmon remains, and naturally regulating prey populations cannot be replicated. Removing them disrupts this delicate balance and reflects a dangerous misunderstanding of how nature works. Predator control programs often ignore the long-term damage they inflict in exchange for short-term gains rooted in outdated wildlife management models. We should be working to protect these apex predators—not eliminate them to suit human interests.

---



**Name:** Sponder, Allison

**Community of Residence:** King Salmon, AK

**Comment:**

I oppose (and despise) the proposed plan for 5 AAC 92.111. Intensive Management Plans, Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation

Management Area. It’s truly appalling. Even if the science was accurate, this is not an acceptable solution. It’s entirely unethical. Populations, especially predatory populations, will control themselves. The fact that you want to maul down bears and wolves simply because you’re mad that you can’t harvest enough caribou for human consumption is sickening. This will hurt the ecosystem more than it will help it. Not to mention some of the bears that might be killed are loved by many. This is overall a terrible idea, all the way around. I don’t understand how you can even justify it. The science and the ethics all point to no.

---



PC1299

**Name:** Spriggs, Ashlie

**Community of Residence:** Sitka

**Comment:**

Meddling just makes matters worse. We need these majestic apex predators to keep habitats healthy. Also it's funded with our tax dollars. They don't go after old and sick bears. They kill cubs and sows on sight.

---



PC1300

**Name:** Springer, Christa

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Stop killing bears

---



PC1301

**Name:** Stade, Alexa

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Stop killing the bears!!!!

---



PC1302

**Name:** Stahl, Victoria

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

These methods have been proven ineffective, utterly disruptive to wildlife, and inhumane. To continue to allow these types of things to happen is incredible folly. You have a national park that is a haven for wildlife and draws countless tourists 30 miles away.

---



PC1303

**Name:** Stanley, Constance

**Community of Residence:** CT

**Comment:**

I am strongly opposed.

---Every year some individuals, who watch the Brooks Falls, Katmai bear cams, spend THOUSANDS of dollars to see CERTAIN bears they have seen on the cameras. Not random bears, but ones who have numbers & sometimes names. Currently there is a bear 128 Grazer (a female w/a yearling cub) who

surprisingly won the annual Fat Bear Week contest twice. This event financially helps the Katmai Conservancy & Explore.org. as well.

-----Bears 747, 856, 164 Bucky Dent, 503, 909, 910, 910jr. Bead, 909jr. Bean, 903 Gully, 83, 32 Chunk, 480 Otis, are extremely popular & draw people in to pay (\$\$\$\$'s per person) to see them. Each bear has a different story & we have been fortunate so far to see cubs grow to be huge 9 year olds and to see rare adoptions happen. Naturalist Mike Fitz has written a book about these bears & research papers documenting the unique behaviors of bears at Brooks Falls.

---- These bears return to this place every year & they tolerate humans being there. Where else ON EARTH, can one walk down a wooded path & just step back off the path as a huge, several hundred pound (to over a 1,000 lb) coastal brown bear casually walks past you....even a mother with cubs? Nowhere...not Russia, not China, ....not even our Montana. There are generations of bears here that have been taught by the previous generation to tolerate/ignore us because salmon is the goal.

---- Moving the shooting area closer to this area would be shooting yourselves in the foot or more likely the wallet.

----Each of these bears is unique in behavior & personalities; so much so that people buy T-shirts, books, mugs, calendars, etc...of them every year. They also donate money every year.

----What may be concerning about the current & expanding shooting area is that mother bears used to bring their first year cubs to Brooks Falls, but now we are seeing less & less mothers with cubs.(Currently 128 Grazer's yearling is the ONLY cub this year at the falls according to the bear cams.) This is a disturbing trend. Mother bears likely move slower (because of cubs obviously), across different territories to get to where they were raised & taught how to fish by their mothers (possibly Brooks Falls).

----Expanding the area of "gunning down the bears" near Katmai may severely impact this Alaska attraction for generations. These bears travel every year to this unique area to feast on the salmon run which we must also protect.

----I ask whether ALL the other options to ensure the population of the Mulchatna Caribou have been explored. Is there a way to treat them for disease? Are there ways to enrich their habitat if it is in poor condition? Would darting the caribou for brucellosis or vaccinating them somehow be an option? I would assume all hunting has stopped & any possible poaching has stopped. I just think a balanced approach may bring back the herd. Can we air drop hay or grain with necessary vitamins to give them an immune boost?

----I just ask that you please don't expand the shooting "range" this year or any year. I really feel that in the expansion, you may kill MANY of the Brooks Falls bears and that would be a huge loss. Anyone can see a bear in a zoo, but only at Brooks Falls can one just walk by you. What a GEM that place is.

----Thank you.

---



PC1304

**Name:** Stanley, Rick

**Community of Residence:** Sarasota, Florida

**Comment:**

Haven't been to Brooks Falls. Several times I can fully attest to the magnificent beauty of this special place. Berries, here and other places are such an integral part of the ecosystem and the amazing beauty of this region. It is a travesty and a tragedy to just drop this another amazing natural settings.

---



PC1305

**Name:** Stann, Deb

**Community of Residence:** Washington state

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the aerial shooting of innocent bears for the sake of human hunters. These bears deserve a place where they can thrive without human interference. Please reconsider this irrational solution. We are not here yo play God with their future.

---



PC1306

**Name:** Stansbury, Bill

**Community of Residence:** Templeton

**Comment:**

Stop this now.

---



PC1307

**Name:** Staples , Hillary

**Community of Residence:** Lagrange

**Comment:**

Please stop killing defenseless bears. Please leave the wild animals and the land alone.

---



**Name:** Stark, Lucy

**Community of Residence:** Australia

**Comment:**

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed Mulchatna bear control program, which would allow the aerial gunning of brown bears from helicopters. I respectfully urge you to reconsider this plan and instead prioritize humane, science-based wildlife management practices.

While I may not live in Alaska, I care deeply about the bears of Mulchatna and the ecosystems they help sustain. These magnificent animals are not only critical to the health of the land, but they also hold deep cultural, ecological, and symbolic significance. The use of helicopters to kill bears is not only ethically troubling—it also risks damaging the delicate balance of the region’s wildlife populations.

Predator control programs like this often lack sufficient scientific evidence to prove long-term effectiveness, and they ignore broader ecological relationships that deserve careful study and respect. As a concerned individual who values biodiversity, conservation ethics, and the humane treatment of wildlife, I cannot support a program that resorts to lethal methods as a first response.

I respectfully ask the Board to halt this plan and instead invest in non-lethal, ecologically informed solutions that reflect a deeper commitment to coexistence and conservation.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---



**Name:** Starkweather , Val

**Community of Residence:** Watkins Glen NY

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose this legislation that allows bears to be killed. It is cruel and inhumane

Please do not allow the killing of brown and black bears to benefit the herds of caribou There are far greater number of caribou than there are either of the bear species

You must reconsider this horrible and cruel assault these beautiful bears have every right if not more it is there home and they have cubs they are not trophies!!!!

---



PC1310

**Name:** Starkweather, Vanessa

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

Why are we killing bears?!? They were put on earth for a reason. They are not over populated. People that are greedy and money hungry are overpopulated. Animals got along just fine before humans decided to take control. How many humans have caused animal extinction.... DO NOT KILL wild animals. Bears, wolves, etc. they are here for a reason.

---



PC1311

**Name:** Starr, Rachel

**Community of Residence:** Boston, MA

**Comment:**

While I understand the effort to protect caribou in the region, eliminating another population does not in the end benefit the ecosystem. Humans create harm when they make changes to the environment just because we have that ability. This is not about each individual bear, but the future impact if we do not regulate horrific animal treatment and population management practices. With our knowledge and innovation, there are better and more humane ways to solve this problem- they just may take more resources. Please consider the power you have over these animals' lives, and use that power responsibly.

---



PC1312

**Name:** Staub, John

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

As a 50 plus year resident of Alaska, I strongly oppose Proposal # 1. I have lived mainly in SE Alaska, appreciating all animals in the wild. I have no problem with responsible, recreational hunting of wolves or bears, however, this predator controlled killing of black and brown bears is neither ethical, natural, or humane.

The Mulchatna bear control program, with no quantity limits, and extending over 40,000 square miles in area is senseless killing and utter nonsense on a grand scale. There is not adequate information on this bear kill program to prove that there are enough bears to sustain a wild bear population.

Brown bears are the most sought-after and valuable animals in the state—and here is the ADFG with a sanctioned killing program all of their own! As far as I know, all game animals are to be managed on a sustained yield basis, including these mothers, cubs, and adult bears.

The proposal here is to preserve the caribou of the area, but your solution of killing off all the bears in this huge area is not the answer. Until there is hard evidence on hand showing that bears are the primary killers of caribou, and that after a massive, unlimited, ADFG bear killing program, there will still be

enough bears remaining to sustain their number, I find the premise of Proposal # 1 very difficult to believe.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this unethical and misguided proposal.

---



PC1313

**Name:** Stauffer , Molly

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Please don't kill our beloved bears! They are an important part of the ecosystem. Many love the bears in that area and would be very upset to lose them.

---



PC1314

**Name:** Steele , David

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Please don't shoot the bears. There has to be another humane way to solve this issue. Karma has a way of getting revenge. We send rockets into space but you can't resolve this issue. I will come up with a number of options if given the chance.

---



PC1315

**Name:** Steele, Hannah

**Community of Residence:** Milwaukee

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed modification of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd. Protecting and maintaining bear populations is incredibly important to the rest of the ecosystem's health, and allowing for increased killing of bears would negatively impact the health of the environment. Bear populations in Alaska are healthier than they are in most other places in the world, and there is no good reason to threaten that. Additionally, there is a chance that bears used to living within the protected bounds of national parks like Katmai could wander into the proposed expanded Caribou Herd Management Area and, after a life free of threat from humans with guns, get killed for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. This measure would be devastating for bear populations and should not be implemented. Additionally, it just seems extremely unfair to gun bears down from helicopters. It is the epitome of human overreach and meddling in the natural world in a way that we should not.

---



PC1316

**Name:** Steele, Kelly

**Community of Residence:** Virginia

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose any bear hunting. Shooting bears from the air (or on the ground) goes against nature. These are healthy bear populations and are a healthy herd and should not be killed. In addition bears from national parks could wander in the area and end up getting killed, which would be devastating.

---



PC1317

**Name:** Steenburgh, Martha

**Community of Residence:** Haverhill, NH

**Comment:**

I oppose killing of Brown Bears and Wolves in Alaska. Bears are only a problem if people who moved into their habitat don't respect their needs. If you feed the birds year round you're inviting trouble. Poorly disposed of trash attracts bears, raccoons, rodents etc. You have to watch Brown Bears at Brooks Falls on Explore.Org. Brown Bears are to be respected and should be able to live their best lives.

---



PC1318

**Name:** Stef, Stef

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

Stop the killing please

Let Wild animals live

---



PC1319

**Name:** Steffey, Anna

**Community of Residence:** Wallingford Pennslvannia

**Comment:**

There is no reason to be slaughtering bears.

---



PC1320

**Name:** Steiger, Andrew

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

This is an insane assault on the ecological systems that have been at work for millennia. Shame on you. Do not continue with this program

---



**Name:** Steiner, Abigail

**Community of Residence:** Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

I oppose this proposal on the grounds that there is no scientific evidence that slaughtering bears benefits caribou. Bears are a crucial part of the ecosystem and mass murdering them is and will continue to throw off the precious balance that exists. The fact that this is being done with no coverage, media, etc. proves that Alaska and the fish and game officers know that it's wrong, immoral, and unethical. These bears are being killed, essentially for sport, and the gene pools and lineage of these bears are being obliterated.

---



**Name:** Stern, Kristine

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Right now, ADFG is proposing to reinstate a taxpayer-funded aerial gunning program targeting bears, including mothers with cubs.

In 2023 alone, 99 bears were killed from the air, and another 80 in 2024. There's no scientific evidence that this slaughter helps caribou populations recover.

These bears are being killed just: 30 miles from Katmai National Park; 3 miles from Lake Clark National Park; and 50 miles from the famous Brooks Falls.

Bears don't know when they've crossed from safety into a kill zone.

Bears roam far. They raise cubs. And they're being wiped out.

There's no scientific evidence this helps caribou.

It's a waste of taxpayer money.

And it's ethically indefensible.

A judge ruled some of these killings illegal - but Alaska kept going, killing 11 more.

These could be the same bears we fly across the world to see.

And they're being erased.

This is a travesty - with no scientific backing. Please do not reinstate this unethical, wasteful practice.

---



**Name:** Stevens, Tammy

**Community of Residence:** KY

**Comment:**

Dear Sir or Madam,

I watch the Katmai bears on Explore.org and I have come to learn their personalities, hardships and interconnectedness. I value the opportunity to watch the Katmai bears and find them to be educational as well as fun to watch. After the Katmai bears, I have now discovered the Yellowstone and Grand Teton bears as well.

I have learned that all wildlife, and particular, bears have hard lives due to the invasion of humans into their territory. Between the roads, vehicles and tourists, there is very little peace.

I plead with you not to cull the bears in Alaska as data indicates this strategy is inhumane and ineffective. Bears are sentient beings that can live rich lives if we leave them alone. Not to mention, the world watches the Alaskan bears and many we know by name or number. This would most certainly be a harsh reflection on the state of Alaska and the ADFG.

Thank you,

Tammy Stevens

---



**Name:** Stewart, Verna

**Community of Residence:** 11 Draycott road

**Comment:**

Stop killing the bears! It's terrible and doesn't help you or the Caribou

The world is watching this

---



**Name:** Sth, Safia

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

Save the bears

It's unacceptable to let that massacre happen

---



**Name:** Stich, Maggie

**Community of Residence:** Wisconsin

**Comment:**

please save the bears :)

---



**Name:** Stoeppelkamp, Sofie

**Community of Residence:** Germany

**Comment:**

Save the bears, they should not be slaughtered for our own sake. Go freaking vegan.

---



**Name:** Stokes, Journey

**Community of Residence:** Boone, NC

**Comment:**

It has been proven that predator control, a.k.a gunning down bears and wolves from helicopters, does nothing in terms of helping the caribou population of this region. All this act does is destroy the natural balance of the ecosystem and its counterparts. If protecting caribou herds is the goal, then forests and streams should be protected instead. Caribou need places to migrate to so they can be more spread out and have more mating opprotunities. In turn, this will create a more even distribution of bears, wolves, and caribou.

---



**Name:** Stoneman, Janet

**Community of Residence:** Southern CA

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the aerial killing of the brown bears for the purpose of saving the caribou herds. There is no scientific evidence to prove that killing bears and including mothers and cubs is effective. Please do not proceed with such a horrific action. Thank you! Janet Stoneman

---



**Name:** Storck, Denise

**Community of Residence:** Chincoteague, Virginia

**Comment:**

I am very opposed to people interfering with natural wildlife behavior. Favoring one type of animal over another is not for people to decide. Let wildlife be free and allowed to live as they were meant to. Wildlife has always surprised us in how resilient they can be and find ways to survive. They don't need people to indiscriminately kill off their natural enemies. It is truly a crime to do so, especially when what's killed is not being used to feed people or help people in any way. These animals are just being animals, and they should be left alone and not killed by shots from high powered rifles from above, as they are clearly defenseless in that situation. It's shocking that in 2025, people still think it's ok to do this.

---



**Name:** Stout, Keri **Affiliation:** Frontier Community Services

**Community of Residence:** Soldotna, AK

**Comment:**

Your first line of defense is always to start shooting ! No in depth studies, just a quick fix. But what always happens with quick fixes, is there are always frightening repercussions that follow. And by then the irreversible damage is done !

---



**Name:** Stoyka Jones, Michelle

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

Do not shoot bears; no to aerial shooting. No to trapping animals too. Let nature manage the population not pseudo science justification of wildlife execution.

---



**Name:** Strasser, Muna

**Community of Residence:** Rock island county

**Comment:**

Please record my opposition to the take of brown and black bears for caribou herd protection

---



**Name:** Streeter, Heidi

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

I do not support this. No one should, it's common sense.

---



**Name:** Strehl , Amanda

**Community of Residence:** Carrollton

**Comment:**

STOP SHOOTING PREDATORS. STOP KILLING PREDATORS.

---



**Name:** Strength, Michele

**Community of Residence:** Alabama

**Comment:**

Please allow these bears to live in dignity

---



**Name:** Strömlblad, Levi

**Community of Residence:** Tyresö

**Comment:**

We need to protect our wildlife. Any indiscriminat killing of bears should be outlawed

---



**Name:** Stykalo , Kayla

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

I support the change to stop harming bears. It does nothing beneficial for the environment and humans need to learn to coexist.

---



PC1339

**Name:** Summitt, Brandon

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla, AK

**Comment:**

I fully support the predator control around the Mulchatna Caribou herd. The bear and wolf population is not in any danger but the MCH population is dangerously low, which warrants predator management by the state. The decision to block the predator management was based on emotion, with no scientific data. Please move forward with responsible predator management that would benefit the MCH.

---



PC1340

**Name:** Sutcliffe, Daniella

**Community of Residence:** Switzerland

**Comment:**

Bears have as much right to live on this as us, if not more. We kill them mercilessly and for what? So that our children will never be able to see one in the wild? So that the whole ecosystem is disrupted? We have enough food, enough land and enough greed to last us centuries, why, I ask must we take more from this Earth?

---



PC1341

**Name:** Svancara, Theresa

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE the Intensive Management for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. I have lived in Alaska for 45 years, part of that time in Dillingham where I recreated and fished in the Wood-Tikchik State Park (near the Mulchatna area). I highly value the diverse and abundant wildlife there. I value the bears. They are part of the ecosystem, and must not be removed entirely in the Bear Predator Control Area (western calving area) as the Alaska Dept of Fish and Game proposes. Removing a predator entirely from an area will unbalance the natural world and is not a role humans should be doing. It is not responsible and is not a humane way to treat wildlife. I strongly encourage you to NOT approve this proposed management plan.

Respectfully, Theresa Svancara

---



PC1342

**Name:** Swati, Swati

**Community of Residence:** Germany

**Comment:**

I don't want that any animal or those innocent bears will be killed. It's inhumane and it should stop

---



**Name:** Sweeney , Kelly

**Community of Residence:** Glencoe

**Comment:**

I am writing today to submit a public comment in opposition to the latest attempt by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) to skirt a series of court rulings to resume its predator control program (adopted in 2022 as Proposal 21.)

Recently Proposal 21 was ruled unlawful for a second time by the courts for insufficient science and the failure of ADFG to hold a public comment period on the Proposal as required by state law.

Now, ADFG is asking AGAIN for emergency permission to sidestep this legal ruling. As before, no proof of any emergency has been offered.

Despite claims of transparency, adherence to the Best Available Science and consideration of public opinion in matters involving public tax dollars, the ADFG has failed in all regards. The public has been excluded, and for good reason: the majority disapprove of such predator control programs, and don't approve of their tax dollars being spent on the egregious slaughter of wildlife. The court found that ADFG had insufficient understanding of bear population numbers, and failed to show evidence that bears negatively impacted caribou numbers. This was hardly the BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE.

As recently as 2023, ADFG released a statement saying what would really help caribou numbers rebound was a temporary ban on hunting them, for perhaps two or three seasons. Humans take more caribou than Alaska's bears do, according to ADFG's own statistics. But instead of inconveniencing people, the agency would rather slaughter hundreds of bears and wolves. This is unacceptable.

This Proposal, not based on science and slammed through without any input from the public, should never have been adopted in the first place.

ADFG should go back to the drawing board, do the science, present it to the public, and hold a public comment period.

I oppose this SECOND "emergency" request to bypass the previous TWO court rulings. The courts have ruled it unlawful. TWICE. The public does not support it.

I urge ADFG to find another solution to this problem, one that doesn't treat the state's wildlife with such callous disregard.

Sincerely,

Kelly R Sweeney

---



**Name:** Sweitzer, Stasja

**Community of Residence:** Ohio

**Comment:**

This is not just our home. It is the bears home too. We should look after the lives on this earth and learn to live in peace with one another. To kill them for simply existing the way they have for hundreds if not thousands of years is inhumane. I beg you to please find humanity, find love in your heart and please do not take any more innocent lives.

---



**Name:** Swiernik, Meghan

**Community of Residence:** New Jersey

**Comment:**

Just stop murdering bears. This sounds like a lazy man's solution.

---



**Name:** Sylvestre, Nicole

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Killing one species to help another, is a lazy approach. Please find a better solution.

---



**Name:** Tabor, Deborah

**Community of Residence:** Fl

**Comment:**

I am appalled that this is allowed to happen. Alaska is one of the last places where people are coming to see natural wildlife in its element and you're gonna kill them off. How dare you. They were here before us .

Do we have to wait till every animal is almost extinct before we stop the nonsense? I'm appalled that such a beautiful is allowing this and your tourism depends on the animals there. What do you thinking? clearly you're not..

---



**Name:** Tak, Jen

**Community of Residence:** Australia

**Comment:**

I'm against the cull is these beautiful animals. I come to this area as a tourist as do many others that I know & I see when I go there. We spend a lot of money to get there & when we are there contribute greatly to the area. I don't agree the cull will make any difference to the caribou herd & there must be other ways that can be introduced- like other countries have - for these wonderful creatures to live side by side.

I do hope you wonderful people can think of a way to keep the economics of the tourism of the bears going with the existence of the caribou & the bears. A difficult one but one that can be overcome. The tourist dollar must be huge - to lose that will be a hole in the local economy - what about a tax on the tourists - I would gladly pay.

---



**Name:** Talbott, Clint

**Community of Residence:** Nederland, Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose the Board of Game's proposal to kill brown bears and black bears. This BOG initiative purportedly is designed to support the health of the caribou herd. But there is no peer-reviewed, scientific evidence supporting such a move. The measure is clearly an effort to support sport hunters at the expense of ecological balance of natural predators and prey. Aerial gunning is also indiscriminate and cruel. Please reject this unscientific measure, which has been twice rejected by Alaska's judges. The BOG is on the wrong side of the law, ethics and science.

---



**Name:** Tanalski, Adam

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

Thanks for saving

---



**Name:** Tarach, Gemma

**Community of Residence:** Earth

**Comment:**

Hello, and thank you for reading my comment. I am contacting you from the great state of Wisconsin. I have been a repeat visitor to the also-great state of Alaska, specifically to the area around King Salmon and Katmai National Park and Preserve. I implore you not to expand the Mulchatna CHMA and to end, once and for all, the pointless and cruel bear and wolf culling that is part of the management program. My request is based on science. Wildlife biologists have provided clear and compelling evidence that killing bears and wolves will not help to conserve the caribou, which are experiencing a population decline due to the climate crisis, which is changing the regional vegetation. This is scientific fact, not the emotional response of someone in the Lower 48. My request is also based on economics, specifically the economy of Alaska, for which tourism brings in about \$6 billion per year, according to your state's travel association. If the Mulchatna CHMA area is expanded and the bear and wolf cull continues, tourists who come to Alaska to view its wildlife will take their money elsewhere. This plan is pointless, cruel, and essentially shooting yourselves in the foot. Don't do it. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

---



**Name:** Taudel, Mary

**Community of Residence:** Astoria

**Comment:**

Opposition to random killing of bears in the wild.

---



Barbara L Taylor  
[REDACTED]  
Sun City West, AZ 85375

July 7, 2025

To the Alaska Board of Game via Electronic Submission

Dear Members of the Board,

I'm writing in **opposition** to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game reinstatement of the Mulchatna Predator Control program, and in particular, the increased killing of bears.

You may question why a resident of Arizona is concerned with this and so I will tell you. My husband and I, often with other friends, visit your great state of Alaska every summer. We love the rugged beauty and abundant wildlife and enjoy getting close to nature and taking photographs. As you're likely aware, Alaska's tourism industry generates an annual economic impact of close to \$6 billion, including \$4 billion in direct consumer spending and close to 50,000 jobs. This summer our plans include a multi-day trip on the Alaska Railroad and a trip out to Kodiak Island. In prior years, we've spent time in Anchorage, Seward, King Salmon and more. We truly love what Alaska offers, especially the bears and other wildlife we're able to view and photograph. The killing of so many bears in such a large area, especially in the reckless manner that the Mulchatna Predator Control program is done, is not needed and repulsive.

ADFG continues to support the idea that killing all the bears and wolves within this particular area will have the effect of increasing the Caribou herd. However, it has been shown that these predators are not the reason behind the dwindling Caribou population, and instead there are numerous other causes, including habitat decline. Further, the State has not assessed how the program would impact the population of bears.

I respectfully urge the Board to cancel their proposal to expand the Predator Control Program in the Mulchatna region. In addition, I strongly suggest that ADFG undertake further studies to learn alternative methods to increase the Caribou herd.

Sincerely,

Barbara L Taylor



**Name:** Taylor, Diane

**Community of Residence:** Clam Gulch

**Comment:**

As a resident of Alaska for 45+ years, I am completely AGAINST the Mulchatna Bear culling program! These bears are constitutionally protected, and an important resource here in Alaska. The gunning down of these bears, from helicopters no less (!) has already been ruled illegal by two judges! Thank you for this opportunity to testify on this very important regulation!

---



**Name:** Taylor, Jane

**Community of Residence:** US resident (Maryland)

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the slaughter of bears in Alaska. Well, wildlife management is important and a priority, it should be done in a way that is not destructive to the ecosystem, into the population of bears. The current slaughter is inhumane.

---



**LAW OFFICE OF KNEELAND TAYLOR, P.C.**

[REDACTED]  
Anchorage, AK 99517  
[REDACTED]

June 18, 2025

Alaska Board of Game  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Submitted online at [www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov](http://www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov)

Subject matter: Comments for consideration at the  
Board of Game Meeting to be held July 14, 2025

Dear Members of the Board of Game:

I am submitting these comments as an individual, and not the representative of any organization. I have lived in Alaska for 50 years and testified before the Board on numerous occasions. I am a member of the Alaska Bar Association, and currently licensed to practice law in the State of Alaska. I am a member of the Anchorage Advisory Committee, and participate as a member of the Game Subcommittee.

**I wish to comment on the Department's proposal regarding intensive management of the Muchatna Caribou Herd.**

**To begin: I oppose the proposal. The specifics are set forth below.**

1. As you the Members of the Board know, the Alaska Wildlife Alliance obtained orders from the Superior Court holding that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd intensive management plan was unlawfully adopted, and directing the Department to cease and desist from continuing the aerial shooting of predators in the on herd's calving grounds. It is for that reason that the Department submitted a new proposal which you the members of the Board will consider at your meeting on July 14, 2025.



I want to begin my comments with an analysis of the exact status of matters; since it is my impression that the Department's focus is too narrow, and that the Department is overlooking important things. And so, I start with the critical express language of Superior Court Judge Andrew Guidi's "Decision and Order" dated March 14, 2025: wherein, he held the Board's decision to authorize aerial control of bears unlawful.

In the final paragraph of Judge Andrew Guidi's ten page Decision and Order, he held, and ruled as follows:

"...the Court hereby Declares that the Proposal 21 , as adopted as 5AAC 92.111(c), by the Alaska BOG on January 24 was unlawfully adopted and , therefore, void and without legal effect."

My point is that Judge Guidi ruled that the regulation, codified as 5AAC 92.111 (c), was **VOID AND WITHOUT LEGAL EFFECT**. That regulation concerned control of predation not only by bears, but also wolves.

5AAC 92.111(c) provided for same day airborne shooting of wolves (or aerial wolf control) in multiple GMU's in western Alaska.<sup>1</sup> But since Judge Guidi declared 5AAC 92.111(c) void and without legal effect, there is no current regulation authorizing aerial shooting wolves; and **AS 16.05.783(a) mandates that there be a regulation authorizing aerial gunning of wolves if any same day aerial shooting is to be conducted, in the multiple GMUs specified in the regulation, by anyone; including Department employees and permittees.**

To put it another way, if there is to be aerial control of wolves, the enactment of a new regulation is required: and the enactment of a new regulation must comply with the applicable statutory and constitutional provisions concerning not only bears but also wolves.

The statutory and constitutional provisions for bears and wolves are not identical: wolves and bears are different species, and wolves have heightened

---

<sup>1</sup> Those Units are specified in the void regulation at 5AAC 92.111(c) as 9B, 17A, 17B, 17c, 18, 19A and 19B.



protection from aerial gunners due to the enactment of A.S. 16.05.783(a) by citizen ballot initiative in 1996. That statute has only been marginally modified since it was enacted by a majority vote of Alaskans; and it continues to prohibit the aerial shooting of wolves unless specified conditions are met and a regulation enacted.

In other words, if any same day (or aerial) shooting of wolves is to be authorized in GMUs 9(B), 17(A), 17(B), 17(C), 18, 19(A) and 19(B), by anyone, it must be authorized in a new regulation adopted in accordance with the mandatory provisions of AS 16.05.783(a).

**2. If the Department's new proposal is enacted as written, the new regulation would violate applicable statutory and constitutional provisions applicable to wolves.**

**(a) A.S. 16.05.783(a) prohibits the adoption of regulations providing for aerial wolf control unless findings are made, by the Board of Game<sup>2</sup>, based on evidence provided by Department biologists, that aerial control is likely to be successful.**

A.S. 16.05.783(a) provides in relevant part that the Board must find based on information provided by the Department, that

**"...objectives set by the board for the population [of the prey species] have not been met and that predation [by wolves] is an important cause for the failure to achieve the objectives set by the board, and that a reduction of predation by wolves can reasonably be expected to aid in the achievement of the objectives..."**

The Department's materials provided in support of its proposal for a new regulation indicate that aerial wolf control has been authorized since 2011 in

---

<sup>2</sup> While the Board may delegate some of its authority to the Commissioner, nevertheless, if the same day airborne shooting of wolves is to be authorized, it is the Board (and not the Commissioner) that must make the findings mandated by AS 16.05.783(a). See AS 16.05.270.



numerous GMU's<sup>3</sup> in an attempt stop the decline in the population of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. And yet the population of the Muchatna Caribou has continued to decline through 2022, until the spring of 2023 when the Department shot and killed approximately one hundred bears on the caribou calving grounds. **In other words, the use of aerial wolf control for 11 years failed to halt the decline in the population of the Muchatna Caribou Herd: that fact is convincing evidence that continued use of aerial wolf control is NOT likely to be successful in achieving the Board's population objectives for the Mulchatna Caribou herd.**

But the Department may argue that things have changed, since the end of 2022, and that now there is a greater likelihood that continued aerial wolf control will prove to be a successful method of management in achieving the Board's population goal for the Mulchatna Caribou herd. The change the undersigned is referring to is the (alleged?) fact that it was not until the spring of 2023, that the Department put its employees in aircraft with directions to shoot and kill all the wolves they can locate. The use of Department employees and use of Department owned or Department-chartered aircraft is apparently a change from what was done for the preceding eleven (11) years when aerial wolf control was conducted by members of the public.

**That change MIGHT BE RELIED UPON BY THE BOARD** to conclude that future aerial control of wolves is likely to be successful. But to rely on the use of Department employees and Department aircraft as providing the grounds for the Board to find a likelihood of success, **WOULD BE A MISTAKE.**

Testimony and materials provided by the Department recently, and at the Board's March 2025 Meeting, and in materials provided to the Superior Court, establishes some success in increasing caribou calf survival since the spring of 2023 when the Department first put its employees in aircraft with instructions to kill as many wolves as they could locate. But the figures provided by the Department

---

<sup>3</sup> Those Units are specified in the void regulation at 5AAC 92.111(c) as 9B, 17A, 17B, 17c, 18, 19A and 19B.



indicate that the number of wolves shot and killed from aircraft by Department employees has been a tiny fraction of the number of bears killed from aircraft in 2023 and 2024: apparently significantly less than one tenth (1/10th)<sup>4</sup>.

Less than 10% is not much. The success of the Department's intensive management program so far, if any, is not the result of killing wolves. The figures of predators killed in 2023, 2024, and 2025, make it clear that the limited success achieved, if any, is the result of the killing of more than 200 bears.

**In other words, after 14 years of aerial shooting of wolves, it is clear that killing wolves from aircraft has been demonstrated to NOT have been a management tool benefitting the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.**

And yet, the Department's proposal for a new aerial wolf control regulation provides for aerial gunning of wolves through the year 2028.

**To be blunt, and to use the vernacular**, the Department has thrown wolves into its IM plan for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd for no good reason. Instead, the Department's rationale appears to be that as long as the Department is paying its employees to kill all the bears they can find on the Mulchatna herd's calving grounds, those employees might as well shoot all the wolves they can find, as well.

**Or in legalese**, the enactment of a regulation authorizing the aerial shooting of wolves simply because the Board has authorized the aerial killing of bears, **violates the statutory scheme benefitting wolves, and the constitutional mandate** that the BOG must engage in **reasoned decision making** when enacting regulations affecting wildlife.

**(b) Predation by wolves on members of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, benefits the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.**

---

<sup>4</sup> The undersigned does not have the exact figures at hand, but recalls something like 12 wolves compared with 190 bears killed. Or 6 percent.



The Department's biologists have identified brucellosis as playing a major role in the multi-year decline of the population of the Mulchatna Caribou herd. **Removal of caribou infected with brucellosis will reduce the spread of the disease through the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.**

Wolves prey on the sick, and physically impaired members of prey populations: and they do that year round. It is common knowledge that wolves have coexisted with prey populations, from time immemorial, and that they play a beneficial role in removing the sick and unhealthy from prey populations.

This common knowledge has been backed up by recent research conducted by Department Biologist Tom McDonough's study of wolf predation on moose on the Kenai Peninsula. He compared road-killed moose with wolf-killed moose and found that road-killed moose include healthy and unhealthy moose of all ages: in other words road-killed moose represent a random sample of moose in the affected area. Unlike moose killed on highways by collisions with motor vehicles, moose killed by wolves are removed from the population selectively. Wolves select their prey, primarily killing unhealthy moose with problems such as osteoarthritis and severe tooth morphology. The Department has Mr. McDonough's materials, and Board members should give consideration to his research. If the Department won't make this research available, I can provide copies.

A responsible program to increase the population of the Muchatna Caribou herd includes recognizing the role of disease (brucellosis primarily) which is limiting the herd's recovery. Removal of infected caribou from the herd will help. That's what wolves do. Rather than removing wolves, the Board and Department should cease persecuting wolves.

Removal of infected caribou by wolves will not only help the herd by containing the spread of Brucellosis, but it will also reduce competition between caribou for the dwindling supplies of lichen and other vegetation preferred by caribou. Those food sources are being replaced by shrubby plants due to climate warming. The Board can't do anything about climate change, but the Board can do something about infected caribou competing with healthy caribou for food. Let the wolves remove the unhealthy so that the healthy can have more of the food they prefer, and which sustains them.



### **3. More Information Should be Collected Before Aerial Killing of Bears is Continued.**

Ryan Scott at the March, 2023 Board of Game Meeting estimated that the Department would kill 12-30 bears in its intensive management program, and yet more than 100 bears were killed that spring: with more than another 100 taken since then.

Since the March 2023 Board meeting, I have listened to much of the testimony and argument provided by Department representatives at Board meetings and Court hearings. I have heard Department representatives say that it is difficult if not impossible to provide figures on the population of brown and black bears which are preying on caribou in the calving grounds because the bears travel from a large area to the calving grounds each spring.

With all due respect, I do not believe that the Department is unable to provide estimates on where the bears are migrating from, and unable to provide population estimates for the GMU's from which the bears are migrating. But if the Department's representations are true, there is no reason why the aerial killing of bears in the calving areas and affected GMU's should be authorized for multiple years, through 2028, as the Department's proposal provides. If the Department doesn't know answers to these critical questions, then the Department should proceed cautiously. "Cautiously" should include restricting bear removal to only the 2026 caribou calving season, and only to the caribou calving grounds. Cautiously should include a restriction on the number of bear to be taken in 2026; and perhaps a restriction limiting removal to the more prevalent of black and brown bears.

Large numbers of bears should not be removed until and unless the Department is able to provide population figures that make it clear that bear removal on the calving ground will enable bear populations throughout all the affected GMU's to be sustainable.

### **4. Bear Viewing.**

Bear viewing is big business and enjoyed by thousands of Alaskans and



visitors throughout some of the GMU's from which the bears are migrating into the caribou calving grounds. The Department must provide information and the Board must consider the impact of its program on bear viewing.

Wildlife viewing is an important and recognized use of wildlife, and if the Board is to engage in reasoned decision making, as mandated by Article VIII of the Alaska Constitution, it must give attention to, and consideration of, the impact of the proposed regulation on bear viewing in the areas from which the bears are migrating. So far, I have not heard a whisper of concern by Department representatives and biologists on the impact of bear removal on bear viewing. There needs to be some attention directed to this.

**5. Conclusion.** The Department's new regulation should not be approved. If a new regulation is approved:

- (a) Aerial shooting of wolves should not be authorized.
- (b) If the aerial shooting of bears is authorized, it should be **only**:
  - (i) for the 2026 calving season,
  - (ii) on the Mulchatna caribou calving grounds;
  - (iii) for a limited number of bears;
  - (iv) if bear populations in GMUs from which the bears migrate are found to be sustainable; and
  - (v) if bear viewing is not substantially negatively impacted.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

  
Kneeland Taylor



To the Members of the Board of Game:

I have previously submitted comments opposing Proposal #1 to be considered at your meeting to be held commencing on July 14, 2025. See my letter dated June 18, 2025 which I filed on the same day. I am now supplementing those comments because additional information has come to my attention.

I oppose the Proposal.

The current Hunting regulations regulations for Wolves in Units 9B, 17A, 17B, 17C 18, 19A and 19B provide for seasons running from August 10-June 30, or August 10-April 30, a daily bag limit of 10, and no limit for the season. See 5AAC 85.056. The current trapping regulations for Wolves in Units 9B, 17A, 17B, 17C 18, 19A and 19B provide for no bag limit, and seasons running from October 1 or November 1 through April 30. See 5AAC 84.270.

Furthermore, same day aerial shooting of Wolves has been authorized in these same Units since 2011, as a tool for controlling their predation on the Mulchatna caribou herd. See 5AAC 111(c)

The Sustained Yield clause of the Alaska Constitution, in Article VIII, Section 4, provides for the utilization, development and utilization of Wolves, subject to preferences among beneficial uses, on a Sustained Yield basis. See *West v. State of Alaska*, 248 P.3d 689 (Alaska 2010). As noted in my previous comments, which I am now supplementing, Judge Guidi in his Decision and Order dated March 14, 2025 declared 5AAC 92.111(c) “void and without legal effect”. That included the provisions of 5AAC 92.111(c) providing for aerial shooting of not only Bears but also Wolves.

Judge Guidi in his Decision and Order held that one reason for declaring 5AAC 111(c) void and without legal effect was the fact that the Department “failed to consider all the factors that are important and relevant to assure sustainability of the bear population.” Citing several decisions by the Alaska Supreme Court, Judge Guidi found that it was apparent that a “deliberative discussion and consideration of important, material factors related to bear sustainability was not undertaken.”

In all the materials provided on the Department’s website concerning the Department’s Proposal #1, there is absolutely nothing concerning the populations of Wolves, in Units 9B, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A or 19B: or the sustainability of



healthy Wolf populations in these Units. These Units consist of vast areas of Western Alaska.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that in regard to Wolves, the Department casually expects the Board to repeat at least one of the errors it made in 2022: when the Board added Bear control to 5AAC 92.111(c). That error, as held by Judge Guidi, was to fail to consider and take “a hard look” at scientifically based data regarding Bear populations and sustainability in the affected area.

It is clear that in regard to Wolves, the same error is likely to be made because no scientifically based data is likely to be provided by Department biologists regarding the populations and sustainability of Wolves in the affected Units, namely Units 9B, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A or 19B.

To put it another way: the Department expects the Board to treat Wolves as if they were vermin, unprotected by AS 16.05.783(a) and Article VIII, Section 4 of the Alaska Constitution. But Wolves are not vermin.

To summarize: AS 16.05.783(a) and Article VIII, Section 4 of the Alaska Constitution require that before same day aerial Wolf control may be authorized throughout Units 9B, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A or 19B, scientifically based data provided by Department biologists must be considered and evaluated by the Board. Thus far in the process leading up to the July 14 meeting, it seems obvious that the Department expects the Board to treat Wolves as vermin, which should be removed to the maximum extent possible.

That’s wrong for the legal reasons discussed above and in my previous comments. And it is also wrong, because it is likely that predation by Wolves benefits the recovery of the Mulchatna Caribou herd because Wolves remove those members of the Herd infected with Brucellosis, and in so doing reduce competition among healthy member of the Mulchatna Caribou herd for the limited vegetation Caribou prefer.

Respectfully submitted, Kneeland Taylor

---

<sup>1</sup> There is also insufficient material regarding Bear populations, and the sustainability of Bears in the affected areas: but the purpose of these supplemental comments is to focus on Wolves.



PC1357

**Name:** Taylor, Natalie

**Community of Residence:** Washington

**Comment:**

These bears should NOT be hunted and shot!

---



PC1358

**Name:** Taylor, Robin

**Community of Residence:** Georgia

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose aerial bear gunning program. Please do not gun down bears from helicopters! This is only 50 miles from Brook Falls where the world watches the fishing bears every year! I enjoy seeing the bears and watching them grow and live a good life! Please let the bears live! We are taking their land with development and they have less area to roam and live! Please give them a chance to live!

---



PC1359

**Name:** Tegtmeier, Tim

**Community of Residence:** Yellowstone

**Comment:**

Where is any scientific e that this is good for the environment? Wolves were reintroduced to Yellowstone and the ecosystem thrives. Bears are good for population control. Their presence improves their ecosystem. Let nature take it course, we don't need to interfere.

---



PC1360

**Name:** Teirstein , Zoya

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

Please consider the role climate change and disease driven in large part by environmental changes may play in reducing food resources for the caribou herd and affecting the caribou themselves. A balanced approach is necessary and killing an unknown number of bears can't be the answer here.  
<https://alaskapublic.org/news/2022-12-30/climate-change-seen-as-suspected-factor-in-western-arctic-caribou-herd-decline>

---



**Name:** Temporary, Amy  
**Community of Residence:** Toronto  
**Comment:**  
Please save the bears  
Thank you

---



**Name:** Terry, Ann  
**Community of Residence:** Illinois  
**Comment:**  
I am against the aerial shooting of bears, and wolves as well. Evidence shows that killing bears will not achieve the desired outcome. Killing apex predators destroys ecosystems. The fact that an agency kills hundreds of apex predators is disturbing and could ruin the bear population -  
Please DO NOT approve the aerial shooting of bears (or wolves)  
Thank you

---



**Name:** Tesoriero, kylie  
**Community of Residence:** new york  
**Comment:**  
this is absolutely absurd to do to animals who are just existing in their habitat naturally who have no idea what is happening to them. Absolutely unacceptable.

---



**Name:** Teuscher, Sofia  
**Community of Residence:** 60 reservoir  
**Comment:**  
Please protect the bears. I do not want my tax dollars to go to the killing of any animals. This is cruelty and unnecessary.

---



PC1365

**Name:** Thomas, Derek

**Community of Residence:** Kelowna

**Comment:**

Stop killing our bears. Thats so inhumane.

---



PC1366

**Name:** Thomas, Diane

**Community of Residence:** United Kingdom

**Comment:**

Hi, I'm a lover of wildlife in any country and am rather shocked and disappointed that it should be deemed necessary to cull these bears, particularly in the rather brutal way from a helicopter. Culling I believe is something that should be resorted to only when absolutely necessary and I personally don't believe, in this instance it is absolutely necessary. Think about the consequences of getting rid of a predator that keeps the population of elk/moose whatever in check. Yellowstone park got rid of wolves until it was realised that the large number of deer were wrecking the land, and wolves have now been reinstated. If the deer are getting less in numbers could it be from human mismanagement of the land

---



PC1367

**Name:** Thompson , Belinda

**Community of Residence:** Fort Worth, Texas

**Comment:**

I am begging you please do not hunt and aerial kill bears. This is cruel and inhumane and there has to be another way to help the caribou without killing bears. GOD created wildlife to manage themselves. Your actions have been ruled illegal at least twice. I love to come to Alaska to see the wildlife but if you kill them until there are no more I won't be back. Wildlife is Alaska's biggest tourist industry so I don't know why you would want to eliminate the wildlife. Please, for all that is holy, stop killing wildlife.

---



PC1368

**Name:** Thompson , Leanna

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

This is absolutely horrific. Grizzly Bears are on the endangered list in Canada and they need to be protected!! To kill mama bears with cubs too is animal cruelty!! I have no words how horrible this is. It needs to stop!!! Alaska should be ashamed!!

---



PC1369

**Name:** Thompson Davis, Gwendolyn

**Community of Residence:** WA

**Comment:**

I am opposed to the intensive management via aerial predatory killing of wolves and bears. The decline of the caribou populations have been demonstrated to arise from disease and lack of food, both probably the result of climate change. The destruction of the predator population will not address the primary reasons for the caribou decline. It seems that the management should be both more nuanced and more human than gunning down sentient animals from aircraft. This is not effective and definitely not ethical wildlife management.

Thank you.

---



PC1370

**Name:** Thomson, Victoria

**Community of Residence:** illinois

**Comment:**

SAVE THE FREAKING BEARS!!!!!!!!!! HUMANS HAVE NO RIGHT TO SLAUGHTER GODS CREATURES IN THIS FORMAT. THIS IS MOTHER EARTH AND WE MUST SHARE OUR LAND WITH THOSE WHO ALSO LIVE HERE. FIND A WAY TO COHABITATE AND QUIT BEING

██████████

---



PC1371

**Name:** Thorley, Georgia

**Community of Residence:** Savannah

**Comment:**

Strongly object the unjust and merciless killing of bear cubs in the name of sport.

This is 2025, do better.

---



PC1372

**Name:** Thornton, Amy

**Community of Residence:** Lousiana

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd.

There is no credible scientific evidence to support the conclusion that Mulchatna bears can be killed sustainably.

There is also overwhelming evidence that predator control programs do not work to recover struggling moose and caribou populations. Per the State's own research, the main reasons for the Mulchatna caribou herd decline are disease and a lack of food, not bear predation.

I want Mulchatna caribou to succeed, but I don't believe the current, unlawful bear control program is the best way to help them.

If the Board of Game wishes to make significant changes to this area, then it is critical to ensure that the decisions are rooted both in credible science and what the people decide.

---



PC1373

**Name:** Throop, Rachel

**Community of Residence:** San Diego

**Comment:**

I do not support any aerial shooting of any animals. It is inhumane. Please stop this bill from passing.

---



PC1374

**Name:** Tiddei, Stephanie

**Community of Residence:** A concerned bear lover from Connecticut

**Comment:**

I completely oppose this cruel method slaughter of the Alaskan Brown Bears! Please stop this senseless act and leave the bears alone to exist the way they deserve to!

---



PC1375

**Name:** Tipton, Riley

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

I do not support this action. Its ethically indefensible.

---



**Name:** Tobin-Shubin, Madelyn

**Community of Residence:** MT

**Comment:**

This is not for the "benefit of the herd", this is for lazy hunting fun. If it was really about helping the herd then stop all hunting of the herd, restore their ecosystem, and ensure long term protections of their range. You are the problem, not the bears.

---



**Name:** Todd, Leslie

**Community of Residence:** Dawson Springs KY

**Comment:**

I lived in Alaska in 1985. In Dillingham ak. I loved the natural beauty in your wonderful state. I just wondered why is this taking place?

---



**Name:** Todordoff, Sharon

**Community of Residence:** MN

**Comment:**

Why does our government feel like they have to keep killing all wildlife? Let them be. If a bear becomes dangerous then they should be removed. The government is rounding up all mustangs, killing bears, big cats , riounding up buffalo, etc. What or who wants this to happen and why? What big corporations want this? I think you should take it to a vote. These wild animals belong to the citizens of this country. Let us decide what should be done.

---



**Name:** Tolbert, Mallory **Affiliation:** True North Travel Co

**Community of Residence:** Minnesota

**Comment:**

We strongly disagree with this proposal. It is inhumane and unacceptable. We will no longer send our tourism dollars to the state of Alaska if this is passed. We simply cannot stand by and watch this happen and if you think there won't bring any backlash or repercussions, you are greatly mistaken. We will certainly pull Alaska from our portfolio and be very vocal to our 400 agencies that they need to do the same.

---



**Name:** Torre, Natalie

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

Save the bears 🐻 gunning them down in a helicopter is not hunting. Its pathetic. Grow up and have some respect for life.

---



**Name:** Torres, Megan

**Community of Residence:** Greenville

**Comment:**

It is fundamentally wrong to shoot innocent wildlife from helicopters for any reason. Shame.

---



**Name:** Tosh, Nafisa

**Community of Residence:** No 1 Back Hill

**Comment:**

Stop killing the bears. This is barbaric.

---



**Name:** Townsend, Lee

**Community of Residence:** Honolulu

**Comment:**

Leave the bears alone!

---



**Name:** Townsend, Lisa

**Community of Residence:** Hudson, WI

**Comment:**

I am writing to firmly oppose the proposed predator control measures in Alaska, especially those that involve aerial shooting of wolves and bears. These practices—which sometimes include the killing of mother bears and their cubs in their dens—are both cruel and morally indefensible. Beyond the ethical concerns, such actions risk upsetting the natural balance of Alaska’s ecosystems.

These control efforts are frequently justified as a way to boost moose and caribou numbers, but manipulating predator populations in this way can create more problems than it solves. It may lead to overbrowsing, damage to native habitats, and significant changes in wildlife behavior. These consequences not only harm the environment but also threaten Alaska's standing as a leader in responsible wildlife management.

I respectfully urge the Board of Game to support policies that protect ecological integrity, uphold ethical wildlife practices, and ensure the long-term health of Alaska's wild species. I advocate for a shift away from lethal methods and toward scientifically grounded, non-lethal strategies for managing predator populations.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this perspective.

---



**Name:** Townsend, Sabrina

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

As a concerned citizen, I support efforts to protect and restore Alaska's caribou populations—but I strongly believe this must not come at the expense of the state's bears.

Bears, including grizzlies and black bears, are a vital part of Alaska's ecosystem. Targeting them under the justification of helping caribou threatens to upset the natural balance, especially when science has shown that predator control is often a short-term solution with long-term ecological consequences.

True conservation should focus on protecting habitat, reducing industrial disturbances, and addressing climate-related impacts that affect both caribou and bears. Removing one species to benefit another undermines the complexity of nature and can lead to greater ecological harm.

I urge wildlife managers and policymakers to adopt solutions that support both species, rooted in science, ethics, and respect for Alaska's wild heritage. We can—and must—protect caribou without sacrificing the bears that also call this land home.

---



**Name:** Tracey, Robert

**Community of Residence:** Nondalton, Alaska

**Comment:**

Robert tracey

registered guide license # 1296

owner Tazimina air

I am opposed to the intensive management plan 5 aac 92.111 shooting brown and black bear with a helicopter.

since this plan has been carried out 2023, 2024 and for 10 days in 2025 I've seen significant reduction in brown bear in the control area. I'm a guide and run a air taxi out of nondalton. I'm out in that area every spring and fall with my own clients and servicing other outfitters for 50 years. Camps in the stuyahok valley koktuli, old man, mosquito are seeing very few bears. a couple camps were out for a month didn't see one bear fall of 2024.

spring of 2025 my camps were contending with Robinson helicopter and super cub flying low over my camps low many times to the point where they wanted to get faa involved. they didn't get any bear. so this activity has affected my business.

there are numerous reasons for mulchatna caribou decline : everyone wants a big bull they got shot off. there was same day airborne caribou got hammered in the winter ate all the lichen hills turned to mud hoof disease.

finally fish and game by their own admission doesn't know how many bears are even in the area. not every bear is a caribou calf killer. some bears are raised to fish eat berries scavenge others are raised to kill caribou calves how does fish and game know the difference it's indiscriminate and not well thought out Robert Tracey nondalton Alaska

---



PC1387

**Name:** Trask, Ron **Affiliation:** Myself

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Comment:**

This is absolutely not sound game management

It's absolutely absurd & destructive

---



PC1388

**Name:** Trichilo, Gabriella

**Community of Residence:** Toronto, Canada

**Comment:**

I have read and under the proposal and strongly disagree with the plans or suggestions. Please cancel this horrible suggestion for the allowance to the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd. This is not a benefit. This is a hindrance to life as it is meant to be.

---



PC1389

**Name:** Tristan, Patricia

**Community of Residence:** New York

**Comment:**

For the past five years I have traveled to Katmai National Park for bear viewing once or twice per season spending 10,000-20,000 tourist dollars per year. Typically numerous friends accompany me. I've spent countless hours reading and researching the reasons given by the governor appointed Alaska Board of Fish and Game for the culling of bears (brown and black) and wolves- specifically the Mulchatna bear control program. I discovered that there has not been any science-based (or any legitimate) research on the caribou-calf killings by brown bears - which is suspect to me considering this explanation has been used since before 1994 to justify the culling numbers. I strongly oppose the Mulchatna bear control program and any culling/killing of wildlife and endangered species by helicopter. Protecting endangered species and their habitat also protects humans and the planet against the ravages of rapid climate change (which, unlike the caribou calve killing by bears "theory", this is supported by science based research and evidence). Bears live incredibly harsh lives without our interference and many will not survive beyond 4 1/2 years. Killing adult boars and sows will take generations to recover. The board of Fish and Game could increase the flow of tourist dollars into Alaska by investing greater protections for Alaskan wildlife. I believe, in a relatively short time, wildlife viewing tourist dollars would quickly rival or surpass the revenue brought in from brown bear hunting and wolf trapping.

---



PC1390

**Name:** Triyanto, Nidia Khairunnisa

**Community of Residence:** Indonesia

**Comment:**

Save the bears for the sake of our ecosystem & for not playing god

---



PC1391

**Name:** Truesdale, Kim

**Community of Residence:** Plainfield Acres

**Comment:**

I oppose the aerial gunning of the Alaskan Bears. This is cruel behavior to these beautiful animals. Please do not continue this cruel aerial assault on these animals and babies.

---



PC1392

**Name:** Tsering, Sam

**Community of Residence:** House Ward No - 14

**Comment:**

Stop this madness,let nature decide

---



**Name:** Tufenkdjian , James

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I do not support anything that potentially hurts the brown and black bears in this area. They should not be hunted for any means. This amendment should end.

---



**Name:** Tully, Leda

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Who wouldn't want to visit Alaska to see those amazing creatures. The fact that so many were killed in secret shows how wrong it is. Please hire competent people to address environmental and human concerns in a way that protects the Katmai and Southwest AK Bears.

---



**Name:** Tuovinen , Angela

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

Please do not harm these majestic beings at this time when so much has been destroyed on this earth. Please, it makes no sense, stop this useless slaughter and interference in nature, this is an old a outdated paradigm and does not serve the higher good. It is cruel and inhumane.

---



**Name:** Twardy, Bernard

**Community of Residence:** Fortaleza/Brazil

**Comment:**

Spare the bears life!!!

Stop the killing!

Provide changes without killing!

---



**Name:** Ulianchenko, Anastasia

**Community of Residence:** Netherlands

**Comment:**

Stop killing the bears!

---



**Name:** UndenDunn, Nicole

**Community of Residence:** Escondido, Ca

**Comment:**

The bears were there first before any people. They deserve to live without human interference. Humans don't need access to every waterfall or lake.

---



**Name:** Underwood, Kerry

**Community of Residence:** Cornwall UK

**Comment:**

OPPOSED

I am totally against the aerial shooting of bears. From research it appears you don't even know the efficacy of this practice. It is barbaric and ill thought out. How does killing female bears with cubs help?

A disproportionate percentage of bears killed were mothers with cubs or females. How does the species continue if you reduce their ability to breed?

The largest cause for decline of the caribou is stated as disease, nutrition and severe winters. This has nothing to do with the bears!

Perhaps supplemental feeding would facilitate an increase in caribou survival rates.

The helicopters would be better utilised for food drops not killing sprees.

I beg you to reconsider and abolish this barbaric practice.

---



**Name:** Upah, Tom

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Trophy hunting for grizzly bears in Alaska is when rich, bored, blood lust hunters seek to claim the heads and hides of Alaska's most magnificent creatures. While trophy hunting disregards the intrinsic value of these animals and perpetuates a culture of exploitation and dominance over nature, this sad symbol of conquest and status is big business in the Last frontier. So let's get into it!

---



**Name:** V, Melissa

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Please protect the brown bears at all costs!

---



**Name:** Vahl, Per

**Community of Residence:** Greenland

**Comment:**

There is no reason for killing bears. Apex predators are self regulating their own populations, and there is no proof of them affecting prey species populations, on the contrary they often maintain a healthy balance in the ecosystem. killing the bears is pointless for the caribou populations.

I do not support the killing of bears.

---



**Name:** Valencia , Michelle

**Community of Residence:** Austin Texas

**Comment:**

Please stop the senseless killing of bears and cubs - there is no evidence that killing them is helping the caribou population.

Please let nature run its course on its own without interference.

---



**Name:** Valencia , Victoria

**Community of Residence:** Mexico

**Comment:**

THIS IS AWFUL!

---



**Name:** Vallejo Loera, Aydee

**Community of Residence:** México

**Comment:**

Opposing Unjustifiable Bear Hunting Practices in Alaska.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to certain bear hunting practices currently permitted in Alaska, with particular concern for aerial hunting. While I acknowledge the complex nature of wildlife management and the importance of hunting for subsistence in some communities, the practice of hunting bears from aircraft is unacceptable and without logical justification.

My primary concerns focus on this method due to its inherent cruelty and lack of "fair chase":

- \* Aerial hunting is profoundly inhumane.

Chasing and shooting bears from aircraft offers the animal no chance of escape. It inflicts extreme, prolonged stress and exhaustion before death, far removed from any ethical standard of hunting. This practice is seen by many as cowardly and morally indefensible.

- \* Its ecological justification is highly debatable.

While often framed as a tool for "predator control" to boost populations of other game species like moose or caribou, the scientific evidence supporting its long-term effectiveness is weak. Many experts argue that factors like habitat quality, climate change, and disease have a far greater impact on prey populations than predator numbers alone. Relying on such a brutal method to address complex ecological issues is a simplistic and often ineffective approach.

- \* It severely damages Alaska's reputation.

The image of bears being harassed and killed from the air is widely condemned by the public and conservation groups, undermining the perception of Alaska as a leader in responsible wildlife stewardship.

Instead of relying on such controversial and often ineffective methods, I urge you to consider and implement more ethical and scientifically sound approaches to wildlife management:

- \* Prioritize robust, independent scientific studies.

Invest in long-term research to truly understand bear population dynamics, the factors affecting prey populations, and the overall health of the ecosystem. Management decisions must be based on solid evidence, not assumptions.

- \* Focus on comprehensive habitat conservation.

A healthy, abundant habitat is the foundation for thriving wildlife populations. Protecting and restoring natural ecosystems is a more effective long-term strategy for all species than simply removing predators.

- \* Invest in non-lethal human-bear coexistence strategies.

As human populations expand, it's crucial to develop methods that allow people and bears to coexist safely, such as public education, effective waste management, and the use of non-lethal deterrents.

- \* Promote sustainable, regulated subsistence hunting where appropriate, recognizing its cultural and nutritional importance, while moving away from broad-scale predator control programs.

- \* Support and expand wildlife viewing tourism.

This sector generates significant revenue by valuing bears alive in their natural environment, providing a powerful economic incentive for their conservation rather than their elimination.

By abandoning cruel practices like aerial hunting and embracing these progressive, evidence-based alternatives, Alaska can uphold its commitment to ethical wildlife management and ensure a thriving future for its iconic bear populations.

Sincerely,

Aydeé Vallejo.

---

**Name:** Vallejo Loera, Samantha

**Community of Residence:** méxico

**Comment:**

Today, I rise to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves — for the grizzly bears and the wolves, magnificent beings who are being hunted, controlled, and exterminated under the guise of management.

I do not agree with the killing of these animals. Not now. Not ever.

Too often, governments and special interest groups justify the slaughter of predators by claiming it is necessary to “protect their prey” — deer, elk, livestock. But this argument is not only scientifically weak — it is deeply flawed in principle.

Predators are not villains. They are not threats to be eliminated. They are essential parts of the ecosystem, playing a vital role in maintaining balance and health in the wild. Wolves control overgrazing. Grizzly bears disperse seeds and regulate prey populations. Their presence shapes the landscape in ways we cannot replicate or fully understand.



PC1406

To say we must kill wolves to save deer is to misunderstand the very meaning of nature. That balance — predator and prey — is not a problem to fix, but a system to respect. It is the circle of life, not a hierarchy of human convenience.

Let's be honest — the real reasons behind the killing of these animals are fear, economic pressure, and the desire to dominate nature. But our fear does not give us the right to erase a species. Our discomfort with the wild does not give us control over who deserves to live or die.

Respecting wildlife is not just an ethical stance. It is a moral responsibility. These creatures were here long before us. They belong to the earth just as much as we do — perhaps even more, because they take only what they need. We take everything.

If we continue to justify violence with false conservation arguments, we will not only lose the wolves and the bears — we will lose ourselves, our humility, and our connection to something far greater than us.

So I say this clearly: We must protect grizzlies. We must protect wolves. Not because they serve us — but because they don't. Because they remind us that not all life exists to be tamed or controlled.

They remind us of wildness, of freedom, and of the raw, sacred balance of life on Earth.

Thank you.

---



**Name:** Valotto, Giovanni

**Community of Residence:** Italia

**Comment:**

I oppose the proposed regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff to benefit the herd.

As it stands, there is no credible scientific evidence in the record to support the conclusion that Mulchatna bears can be killed sustainably.

There is also overwhelming evidence that predator control programs do not work to recover struggling moose and caribou populations. Per the State's own research, the main reasons for the Mulchatna caribou herd decline are disease and a lack of food (due to climate change), not bear predation.

I want Mulchatna caribou to succeed, but I don't believe the current, unlawful bear control program is the best way to help them.

If the Board of Game wishes to make significant changes to this area, then it is critical to ensure that the decisions are rooted both in credible science and what the people decide.

---



PC1408

**Name:** Valusia , Le

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Nature always has and always will work its own self out without human interference, the way it did for millions of years. Human interference is what causes disturbances and imbalances in populations. If you want other wild animals to flourish perhaps stop developing land and building roads or other barriers that make it difficult for wild animals to migrate. Leave nature alone - humans are the ones that ruin things - not the innocent bears. Not one single bear better be killed. Mind your own business.

---



PC1409

**Name:** Van baar, Roos

**Community of Residence:** Netherlands

**Comment:**

Stop killing bears! It is not an affective way of solving a problem!

There is no good reason for allowing the killing!

---



PC1410

**Name:** Van den Hurk, Monique

**Community of Residence:** Kamuela Hawaii

**Comment:**

Please do your research. When wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone the areas thrived. The forest regenerated. Let nature do

It's thing. Please stop interfering

---

**Name:** Van Der Maelen, Marieke  
**Community of Residence:** Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, PA



PC1411  
1 of 2

July 7, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in OPPOSITION to the State's RC009.

On May 7, 2025, Judge Rankin of the Alaska Superior Court ruled in favor of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance (AWA). Judge Rankin found that the state, by pushing the 2025 spring Mulchatna bear control through an emergency petition, was not in compliance with a prior Superior Court order (issued March 14, 2025 by Judge Guidi's order). This previous order ruled that the Mulchatna bear control program was "unlawfully adopted and, therefore, void and without legal effect" because it violated due process and the sustained yield requirements set by the Alaska Constitution.

Also, nothing has changed since the initial ruling that the program is unlawful. The State needs to adhere to and respect its own constitutional process in order to maintain the trust of the public and to maintain and sustainably preserve wildlife habitat and resources. The impact this culling program has on the bear population and ecosystem would be devastating and affects an area the size of Kentucky state. This area is only 30 miles from the borders of Katmai National Park and just 3 miles from Lake Clark National Preserve. The impact of this unethical practice, long term and in the broader ecosystem, could be irreparable. Bears play an integral role in maintaining the health and stability of Alaska's ecosystems. As apex predators, bears help to regulate populations of other species and prevent overgrazing that negatively affects vegetation. The removal of bears 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. In addition to the damage to the natural ecosystem, bear watching at Katmai National Park and Preserve, King Salmon, AK alone (according to a 2018 National Park Service Report), brought in 37,818 visitors to in 2017 and those tourists spent \$58,068,200 in communities near the park. That spending supported 756 jobs in the region and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$84,646,600. The tourist industry continues to grow as the Bears of Brooks Falls gain more followers each year.

Bears have enormous territories and travel well beyond the Katmai National Park and Lake Clark National Preserve limits. Bears do not adhere to man-made boundaries. As of 2020, The report shows **\$20.2 billion** of direct spending by more than 318 million park visitors in communities within 60 miles of an Alaskan national park.

Please consider these long-term effects on wildlife and their natural habitats that could result from such drastic and unnatural action.

In conclusion, in addition to the negative ecological impact this would have on Alaska's environment, there has been lack of public notice given for this process. This proposal for emergency regulations was not available at the start of this meeting, and became available as it was announced verbally. My position on this matter has not changed since the initial ruling. The public has the right to know that our beloved bears and wild ecosystems will be protected for

July 7, 2025



PC1411  
2 of 2

generations to come. It is imperative that the recent ruling that Mulchatna bear predator control is illegal and that the May 7<sup>th</sup> ruling by Judge Rankin be upheld. If the Board can rewrite their own interpretation of this order, draft their own proposal and pass off their proposal as an “emergency order” in spite of a court ruling, then that would set a terrifying precedent for anyone who cares about ethical hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing in the state of Alaska.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Marieke Van Der Maelen



PC1412

**Name:** Van Liempt, Axel

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

I am absolutely opposed to the gunning down of wolves and bears in Alaska. The courts already have ruled twice against this barbaric slaughter, how can this be brought up again? These Bears contribute to the wellbeing of of the whole ecosystem, and are not harming anybody. They are omnivores and eat a vegetarian / Salmon diet most of the time. This is trophy hunting in its worst form, and I am absolutely disgusted by it - some rich, selfish, entitled A@@##\$\$%% want to gun down bears that are contributing to the tourism industry (see how many people fly to Katmai annually to photograph and view them and all the \$\$\$ they are bringing to the state). Predators are needed to keep the ecosystem in balance. I have masters degree in biology, and know the importance of a top predator for the health of the whole ecosystem. Stop this barbaric killing!

I am absolutely opposed to the senseless killing of Grizzly Bears and strongly oppose this barbaric attempt to circumvent already previous court rulings with this renewed attempt. I spent every year a good 30K vacationing in Alaska, because of the opportunity to see and photograph grizzly bears and there are hundrets or thousands of people travelling to Alaska every year to see these majestic animals.

Grizzlies are an important part of the Alaska Eco System, amd while most of their diet consists of plant materials, they help maintain healthy Caribou hers by eating deceased animals or sick individuals, therefore helping these herds to stay healthy and thrive.

I have a master's degree in Biology and fully understand the benefit the Grizzlies provide,- this continued effort to kill Grizzlies seems to be motivated by Trophy hunting and just individual hatred of bears by a few people in the Alaska F&W office who do not understand the benefit these bears provide to both the eco system and also the economical benefit they represent brining in tourist dollars. Thank you for protecting the bears!!



PC1413

**Name:** Van Overbeke, Julie

**Community of Residence:** Belgium

**Comment:**

I do not agree with the killing of bears in an ill attempt to save the caribou, find another way!

---



PC1414

**Name:** VanBrunt, Angela

**Community of Residence:** Philadelphia Pennsylvania

**Comment:**

I am against any kind of hunting especially because people are so greedy what are they want the bears out of the way so they could build more crap I would 100% sign any paper that would try to harm an animal there's something seriously wrong with this country thank you Angela VanBrunt

---



PC1415

**Name:** VanDyk, Bev

**Community of Residence:** B.C. Canada

**Comment:**

No one has the right to kill bears or any animal.

---



PC1416

**Name:** Vargas, Eduardo

**Community of Residence:** Mesquite Texas

**Comment:**

I oppose the slaughter of bears and wolve, I Believe more research should be put forward before the indiscriminate slaughter of beautiful iconic animals like bears and their cubs, and others like wolves. its sad since this and other animals are also part of an eco system that perhaps have been altered and thats why the caribou herds are suffering, maybe its time humanity takes an step back and observe using science not prejuidice. also the earth is ever evolving maybe there is also changes at a deeper level.

---



PC1417

**Name:** Varrell, Maggie

**Community of Residence:** anchorage alaska

**Comment:**

save the bears-stop tourism

---



PC1418

**Name:** Vasquez, Yessenia

**Community of Residence:** San Pedro California

**Comment:**

I oppose to this bill slaughtering bears for being in their own habitat is evil! Leave the bears alone!!

---



PC1419

**Name:** Veety, Yvonne

**Community of Residence:** Alabama

**Comment:**

The practice of killing Alaskan bears is unnecessary and quite frankly, disgusting. I'm against this. It has already been ruled against by a court of law. Stop!

---



PC1420

**Name:** Vega, Mia Amor

**Community of Residence:** Bay Area

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed regulation outlined for consideration at the July 14, 2025 Board of Game meeting.

This proposal is not only deeply disturbing, but it also reflects a dangerous departure from ethical, science-based wildlife stewardship. The suggested changes are harmful, inhumane, and completely at odds with the values of conservation and respect for the natural world.

I am horrified that this is even being considered. If passed, it will have devastating consequences for Alaska's wildlife populations and ecosystems. Furthermore, proposals like this erode public trust in the state's ability to manage natural resources responsibly. This decision should be guided by ecological science, public interest, and a fundamental respect for life—not by politics or special interests.

Please do not move forward with this proposal. I urge the Board to reject it entirely and instead prioritize policies that reflect compassion, sustainability, and sound ecological practices.

Respectfully,

Mia Amor Vega

---



C1421

**Name:** Velarde Velarde, Michelle

**Community of Residence:** Anaheim

**Comment:**

We need the bears for the ecosystem and there is no scientific evidence proving this helps the caribou. President Teddy Roosevelt would be ashamed.

---



PC1422

**Name:** Verdugo, Alana

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

There's no scientific evidence that this slaughter helps caribou population recover. There is no need to kill these innocent bears.

---



PC1423

**Name:** Vestal, John

**Community of Residence:** UNIT 1513

**Comment:**

This is appalling. Please consider alternatives. Bears deserve an equal chance at survival without human interference

---



PC1424

**Name:** Vina, Maria Valentina

**Community of Residence:** California

**Comment:**

Killing brown bears in Alaska is not only unnecessary. It's harmful to the environment and deeply irresponsible. Brown bears play a critical role in maintaining healthy ecosystems. They help control prey populations and disperse seeds through their diet, contributing to forest growth. When we remove them, we disrupt this natural balance.

Moreover, Alaska's brown bears are iconic wildlife species that attract visitors from all over the world. Trophy hunting and large-scale killings damage Alaska's reputation and economy by threatening tourism and wildlife photography industries.

Ethically, killing these intelligent, sentient animals, often for sport or to reduce predator numbers, raises serious concerns. Studies have shown that killing bears doesn't meaningfully increase ungulate populations, despite what some argue. Instead, it causes stress to the surviving animals and weakens their gene pool.

Protecting brown bears means protecting Alaska's wild legacy, for future generations, for the health of the land, and for the bears themselves.

---



PC1425

**Name:** Viveros Watty, Luly

**Community of Residence:** Banff - national park

**Comment:**

I am opposed to approve. Humans should not blame just blame bears and for sure no mama bears with cubs. What would happened if the bear population gets in risk??

---



PC1426

**Name:** Vogel, Julie

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

**Comment:**

For the past 19 years I have traveled to Katmai National park for Brown Bear viewing once or twice each year. My husband and I and my mother. We spend \$10,000-20,000\$ each per summer. We have cousins who live in anchorage, they have visited Brooks with us a few of those years We love the bears! We have spent hours reading and researching why the governor appointed the Alaska board of fish and game for the culling of brown and black bears, wolves this is suspect to myself and my family! There is no science based evidence on caribou calf killing by brown bears! This has not been done since 1994. We strongly oppose the Mulchatna bear control program and any culling/killing of wildlife and endangered species by helicopter. Protecting endangered species also protects humans and the planet against the ravages of rapid climate change which is supported by science. The board of fish and game could increase tourist dollars into Alaska by investing greater protections for Alaskan wildlife. I believe, in a relatively short time, wildlife viewing tourists dollars would quickly rival or surpass the revenue brought in by brown bear hunting and wolf trapping.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my experience and views! I love Alaska and its wildlife especially the bears and wolfs.

Sincerely Julie Vogel

---



PC1427

**Name:** Vogt, Susan

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

This is clearly unethical, unnecessary and solely cruel!! You idiots should be fired! Your slaughtering of those bears last year are reprehensible!!!!

---



PC1428

**Name:** Vuceljic, Angela

**Community of Residence:** NEW YORK

**Comment:**

It is inhumane to kill her harm any living creature. Stop killing the bears.

---



PC1429

**Name:** Vuceljic, Stephanie

**Community of Residence:** Yonkers

**Comment:**

Stop killing bears

---



PC1430

**Name:** Vuotto, Angela

**Community of Residence:** Tabernacle NJ

**Comment:**

Please stop the killing - it is cruel beyond words, humans must stop being killing machines , and we don't realize we are killing ourselves. We are creating pain and destruction- we can do better - we must do better- they live here with us , among us, please please stop- be gentle and share this beautiful world... we must stop the violence.

---



PC1431

**Name:** W, Sara

**Community of Residence:** Arizona

**Comment:**

My husband is a regular visitor at Brooks Falls and his industry (wildlife photography) brings tens of thousands of visitors and tourist dollars to your state every year. Aside from this being an absolutely barbaric and low-effort system of "managing" wildlife, if you start killing off the Brooks falls, Lake Clark etc bears, that is going to severely impact tourism and revenue to local people up there. We stopped bringing business to Wyoming for the same reason. Do better folks.

---



PC1432

**Name:** Wagner, Roxy

**Community of Residence:** Netherlands

**Comment:**

I don't get why we got the right to kill Innocent animals without them being a problem to any other being. I also believe we already kill zo many beings, and it has to stop. If we did the samen thing to humans it would be inhumane. But just because there animals who can't speak for them selfs, doesn't mean they don't deserve to life.

---



PC1433

**Name:** Walker , Anthony **Affiliation:** Kids wildlife research center

**Community of Residence:** Sacramento

**Comment:**

I am supporting to stop shooting/slaughtering the bears it's very concerning to me and other that you just wake up one day and decide there's to many bears in an area in which they should be protected and free to roam an eat as much caribou they want who are you to diminish a population without the right research just wiping out a % of a beautiful bear species if your in there home killing for fun

---



PC1434

**Name:** Walker, Vic

**Community of Residence:** Juneau

**Comment:**

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed changes in the management of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd to include the killing of brown and black bears by state employees. I believe there is no justification for extreme predator control methods, which includes shooting these animals from aircraft. Thank you.

---



PC1435

**Name:** Walker, Victoria

**Community of Residence:** New Zealand

**Comment:**

Hello, I am a tourist to Alaska from New Zealand. I have visited twice in the last 5 years, and will make another trip in September 2025. What brings me to your state is your wildlife, and specifically your bears. I do not support any action that permits killing of bears for recreational or for presumed herd management purposes. I cannot understand why you would even consider such a proposition. It detracts from the international reputation of Alaska and would not be viewed favourably by international contributors to your economy such as myself. I oppose these proposed modifications to the regulations.

Regards, Victoria Walker

Auckland, New Zealand

---



PC1436

**Name:** Wallin, Brinn

**Community of Residence:** Sacramento

**Comment:**

SAVE THE BEARS!!!

---



PC1437

**Name:** Walser, Bianca

**Community of Residence:** Achberg

**Comment:**

Introduction:

In Alaska, debates have emerged around predator control as a way to support declining caribou populations. At the Clark River, some propose killing bears to reduce predation on caribou calves. However, such an intervention is not only ecologically questionable but also ethically problematic and scientifically unsound.

**Main Argument:**

1. Disrupting natural ecosystems is risky and often counterproductive

Bears are an essential part of the natural ecosystem in Alaska. As apex predators, they help maintain ecological balance by preying on weak or sick animals, including caribou. Removing bears disrupts this balance and may lead to unforeseen negative consequences in the long term, affecting many species—not just caribou.

2. Caribou population changes have complex causes

Caribou numbers fluctuate due to a variety of natural and human-related factors: climate change, habitat loss, disease, parasites, and human disturbances (such as road construction and mining). Bear predation is just one of many influences and not necessarily the main reason for population declines. Focusing only on predators oversimplifies a much more complex problem.

3. Scientific evidence shows predator control rarely works long-term

Research from Alaska and Canada shows that killing predators like bears rarely leads to sustained increases in caribou numbers. In many cases, caribou herds do not recover because underlying issues—such as habitat degradation—remain unresolved. Moreover, reducing one predator population can cause another to increase, further destabilizing the system.

4. Ethical responsibility to protect wildlife

Bears are intelligent, ecologically vital animals that deserve respect and protection. Targeting them without strong, science-based justification violates ethical wildlife management principles. Killing one species to benefit another, without fully understanding the consequences, is a dangerous precedent.

5. Alternative solutions exist

Instead of killing bears, more sustainable strategies should be explored—such as protecting critical calving areas, restoring habitats, minimizing human disturbances, and improving monitoring and data collection. These actions support caribou populations without harming other species.

**Conclusion:**

Killing bears at the Clark River is a short-sighted response to a complex ecological issue. Rather than seeking quick fixes, we must embrace long-term, science-based solutions that respect the integrity of Alaska's ecosystems. True wildlife conservation means protecting all species—not sacrificing one for another.

---

**Name:** Walsh, George

**Community of Residence:** Gilbert, AZ

**Comment:**

Leave the bears alone. Wild and free as they should be. No hunting of bears.

---





**Name:** Walsh, Patrick  
**Community of Residence:** Soldotna

5 July 2025

To: The Alaska Board of Game  
From: Patrick Walsh  
Soldotna, Alaska  
Subj: Comments on Proposal 1.

I am a retired US Fish and Wildlife Service Biologist, having worked at Togiak National Wildlife Refuge (GMU 17 and 18) for 23 years conducting research and management on caribou, wolves, and bears.

I oppose Proposal 1. I find that this proposed change reiterates findings that have been demonstrated to be incorrect in wolf control, and repeats the same findings in the context of bear control. I recommend that as the BOG considers this proposal, it seriously considers the entire proposal, including the wolf recommendations, and not simply the additions to include bears.

My specific comments address the findings below (in italics) from Proposal 1:

*(3) findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:*

*(A) the population and harvest objectives for the MCH are below the IM objectives throughout the herd's range;*

The population and harvest objectives are the problem that underlies this issue. The objectives are not realistic, but are based on ecological conditions that occurred 25 years ago and have since changed. By establishing realistic objectives such as have been recommended to the BOG during its January meeting and previous meetings, predator control can end and human harvest can re-commence.

*(B) wolves are a major predator of caribou in the range of the MCH and are an important factor in failing to achieve these objectives;*

This is incorrect. Over the past 13 years, ADFG's research staff has demonstrated that wolf predation is not an important factor in failing to achieve the population and harvest objectives.

*(C) a reduction of wolf predation can reasonably be expected to aid in achieving the objectives;*

Again, ADFG's work for the past 13 years has demonstrated this to be incorrect.

*(D) reducing wolf predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;*

Again, ADFG's work for the past 13 years has demonstrated this to be incorrect. Why continue an action year after year when it has consistently failed? Secondly, not only has reducing wolf predation proven ineffective, but the assertion that it follows "recognized and prudent active management techniques" and is "based on scientific information" appears incorrect and contrary to accepted methods of adaptive management. I recommend that the BOG encourage ADFG to seek external expert review of this program to determine whether or not it is based on science.

*(E) reducing wolf predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;*

Again, ADFG's work for the past 13 years has demonstrated this to be incorrect.



*(F) reducing wolf predation is in the best interests of subsistence users;*

Focusing on unrealistic population objectives and attempting to address the issue through wolf control has not only failed, but has resulted in closing the harvest to subsistence users, rather than permitting a sustained harvest at a lower level. Thus, it is not wolf predation that works against the interest of the subsistence users—it is the management focus.

*(G) bears are a major predator of caribou in the range of the MCH and are an important factor in failing to achieve caribou population and harvest objectives;*

This has not been demonstrated. ADFG's work has shown that bears eat caribou, but this is an uninteresting observation. They do so wherever both species occur, including populations of caribou that demonstrate strong demographic performance in the absence of predator control. More specifically on this point, in a 13 May 2025 press release, ADFG Commissioner Lang stated that the bear control program had "turned the herd around" based on a single year of data (2024) in which the population estimate was found to be 16% higher than the previous year. However, the geographically adjacent Nushagak Peninsula Caribou Herd showed a 22% increase in the same year, even though it has never been subject to predator control. I find it more likely that environmental conditions affecting the habitat of both herds is the controlling force for the populations, and that predation is not a primary population driver for either herd.

*(H) a reduction of bear predation in certain areas like calving areas can reasonably be expected to aid in achieving the objectives;*

ADFG has not performed a habitat assessment to determine whether the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd can sustain 50,000 caribou. Until this is done, focusing on predator management is a guess. Further, the failure of 13 years of wolf control to achieve the objectives provides a strong suggestion that adding bear control to the effort is a continuation of this ineffective effort.

*(I) reducing bear predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;*

As stated above under the wolf findings, an external technical review of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd intensive management program would demonstrate its strengths and weaknesses.

*(J) reducing bear predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns; and*  
Same comments as above.

*(K) reducing bear predation is in the best interests of subsistence users.*

The subsistence user interest is best served by re-opening the harvest of caribou at a sustainable level rather than continuing the current program.



PC1440

**Name:** Walter, Eliza

**Community of Residence:** Aistralia

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the regulation to modify the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area to allow for the take of brown and black bears by department staff. There is no evidence that it benefits the herd. Let nature be and stop interfering.



PC1441

**Name:** Walters, Harley

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Killing wolves hasn't slowed caribou decline; scientists suggest renewed emphasis on securing habitat.

As above, reduction in bear numbers won't have a positive effect. It's more harmful to the ecosystem and environment not to mention increasing poaching numbers when you introduce culling like this.

It's an all around fail and cruel end to many beautiful bears and wolves.

Please don't bring this back. It simply doesn't work. All it does is stroke the ego of gun slinging dorks in choppers.



PC1442

**Name:** Walters, Riva

**Community of Residence:** Iowa

**Comment:**

Save the bears



PC1443

**Name:** Warn, Nicholas

**Community of Residence:** I'll

**Comment:**

Madness in my eyes nature will

Balance itself

---



PC1444

**Name:** Warrilow, Jenni

**Community of Residence:** Aintree

**Comment:**

This behaviour is barbaric, slaughtering innocent animals to protect another. It's unethical - let Mother Nature take course and allow these beautiful brown bears to roam freely like they are meant to. Killing mothers and their cubs just shows how disgusting humans are, these poor animals are meant to roam and enjoy this planet just as much as we are and caribou. There's no scientific evidence to support there is any reason or benefit to doing this it's only slaughter and killing.

---



PC1445

**Name:** Waters, Wendie

**Community of Residence:** Texas

**Comment:**

I am writing to urge you to reject the latest plan from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game which would authorize aerial gunning down of wolves, brown bears, and black bears across a 40,000 square mile area!! This area is bordered by the purposeful YUKON DELTA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TOGIAK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, KATMAI NATIONAL PARK AND LAKE CLARK NATIONAL PRESERVE!!

This operation is inhumane and unethical, causing unnecessary suffering to the bears... AND represents a troubling approach to wildlife management. In addition, AS YOU ARE WELL AWARE, it lacks a scientific foundation as study after study shows that predators are not the major factor determining the population of moose, caribou, and other game animals. ADFG is sidestepping the fact that such action will disrupt ecosystems for the obvious purpose of sport killing vs scientific foundations.

The practice is not only seen as unethical and inhumane but seen as damaging Alaska's reputation as a responsible steward of its natural resources and will most certainly if enacted, filter down to boycotting Alaska's economy because of this obvious uneducated attack on apex predators.

In addition, you would also know in your position, that the killing of older, experienced bears can lead to the loss of vital survival knowledge for younger bears. If you proceed with this egregious act, it is a stamp of approval that your commission does not care about the viability of the targeted species.

A similar Alaskan predator control operation in 2023 killed approximately 100 brown bears (including cubs) and black bears, far more than the original planners estimated. This suggests that the Department cannot control the true mortality levels during these exercises.

I strongly urge you to reconsider this senseless plan and prioritize a more balanced, humane approach to wildlife management which we the people expect of those placed in vital positions such as yours.

These animals are critical to a healthy ecosystem and planet, one that we would like future generations to be able to enjoy.

Concerned Environmental Advocate,

Wendie K. Waters

---

**Name:** Watkins, Bill

**Community of Residence:** Denali Park

**Comment:**

I would like to comment on ADF&G's proposed regulation changes that would allow ADF&G to kill grizzly (brown) bears over a 40,000 square mile area in western Alaska.

I urge the BOG to reject these proposed regulation changes.

Due to the proximity of Lake Clark National Preserve, Katmai National Park, near the borders of Togiak and Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuges, such a program is guaranteed to kill these bears once they leave these protected lands.

It is time to stop the madness of squandering limited state funds on a killing spree that does nothing to address the underlying causes of habitat change (loss of lichens and mosses) due to climate change.

Nor does this proposed killing spree address the issue of infected caribou with brucellosis.

Due to the low reproductive rate of grizzly bears, their populations are fragile and are susceptible to human caused population declines, especially when females are killed. Females are the foundation of any grizzly bear population.

Based on the state's previous targeting of females, females with cubs, subadults and males this insures a ursine killing field of over 40,000 square miles.

As of this time, ADF&G has not conducted any population studies or knows the population dynamics (ratio of males, females, subadults and cubs), natural mortality or whether the population is increasing, decreasing or stable.

Furthermore, ADF&G has claimed that there is a "high" bear population within this area due to anecdotal opinions from hunters. Yet, they do not specify by numbers what a high population is for this area.

Naturally occurring bear populations vary dependent on food availability, types of food, calorie content, habitats and ecosystems and onset of winter weather.

In general, bears south of the Alaska Range who have access to salmon and other rich food sources will be able to support more bears. Bears north of Alaska Range who do not have access to these rich food sources will be fewer in number.

Comparing the bears in Denali (north of the Alaska Range) versus the bears at Katmai (south of the Alaska Range) illustrate this difference perfectly.

Katmai supports more bears, they are larger, yet this larger population reflects what the habitat/ecosystem can support.

More bears in a naturally regulating ecosystem does't suggest a "high" bear population; it is a natural reflection of the habitat that can support that population.

ADF&G uses the term "high" in a pejorative manner, yet they do not define it nor do they have any current population studies to support it.

Additionally, the only way one could have a “high” bear population is if it was artificially fed by humans whether directly or indirectly through garbage, improper food storage, bait sites, or through intentional feeding.

I have not read anywhere where ADF&G makes this claim. Consequently, there is no “high” bear population.

Due to the lack of ADF&G’s bear population studies, they have yet to determine what a sustainable grizzly bear population is within this area. This is why knowing the population dynamics and natural mortality rates in this area is so important.

Furthermore, ADF&G fails to consider other forms of the Mulchatna caribou herd decline that makes predator control irrelevant.

Habitat/ecosystem/vegetation change is occurring throughout Alaska and is leading to declines in other caribou herds. Caribou must have the types of vegetation that can support their populations.

If there isn’t enough of the critical vegetation types, then the populations decline. Caribou are dependent on lichens and mosses which are being crowded out by willows, dwarf birch and alder.

While the expansion of specific willow types will benefit moose, they are of no benefit to caribou during the winter months.

Additionally, with Alaska having more heavy snowfall/icy type winters, this blocks caribou from reaching their food sources.

These factors are attributed to global climate change, yet I have yet to hear ADF&G discourage oil development or the burning of fossil fuels to maintain caribou herds and habitat.

Combine the above with a highly contagious disease such as brucellosis and it should be expected that the Mulchatna caribou herd would decline.

Both wolves and to a much lesser degree grizzlies, can limit the expansion of contagious diseases such as brucellosis. Predator control encourages the expansion of such diseases as the removal of predators encourages more intense spread of disease outbreaks.

In the Lower 48, Montana, Idaho and Wyoming refuse to acknowledge this fact through their anti-predator policies and consequently, chronic wasting disease is spreading throughout ungulate herds in these states and the west.

Also, I am not aware of ADF&G conducting vegetation studies to determine current quality of caribou habitat within the Mulchatna area nor of the rate of plant succession.

This is critical in determining the rate of decline of the habitat to determine what caribou numbers the habitat will support.

Quite simply, ADF&G hasn’t done any comprehensive studies to justify these regulation changes and I urge you to reject them.

---



**Name:** Wavrin, Martha

**Community of Residence:** Henderson, MN

**Comment:**

Concerning the Mulchatna Predator Control Program and aerial hunting of black and brown bears, I am OPPOSED to this cruel and unscientific hunt. There is NO science that backs the implementation of this hunt! Until the science shows a clear link between the lower population numbers of the caribou, versus the population and behavior of the bears, there is no way to validate such a hunt, and certainly not a hunt carried out by the mechanical nightmare that a helicopter or plane creates for those animals living in a natural and native habitat.

Although I am currently not a resident of Alaska, I have lived in the state, have family in the state, and have traveled many miles in it, largely by foot and bike. Alaska is the last place left in the United States where we can actually let many ecosystems run as they were meant to run, without the "management" of humans, or at least a minimal impact. That allows Alaska to actually be able to study the true science of ecosystems!!! What a gift to science and mankind, but instead we are going to ignore science and continue down the road that the lower 48 has already gone, wasting and destroying as it goes.

---



**Name:** Wedel, Dana

**Community of Residence:** Rancho Cucamonga, California

**Comment:**

We flew to Alaska in our plane with a group of pilots. Brooks Falls was a highlight of our trip. I wear my Bear education pin all the time. Do not kill the bears. We need the predators when we killed wolves our environment changed for the worse. We need all of the animals.

---



**Name:** Weicman, Sharon

**Community of Residence:** Norwalk, CT

**Comment:**

Alaska Board of Game

P.O. Box 115526

Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Bear and Wolf Hunts Near Key Protected Areas

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

I am writing to express strong opposition to any proposals that would authorize the hunting of bears and wolves in areas bordering Lake Clark National Park, Katmai National Park, the McNeil River State Game

Sanctuary and Refuge, Brooks Falls, the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

These regions are internationally renowned for their spectacular concentrations of brown bears and healthy wolf populations. Each year, they attract tens of thousands of wildlife enthusiasts, photographers, filmmakers, and ecotourists—generating significant economic revenue for nearby rural communities and businesses. Visitors come from around the world to witness the iconic bear activity at places like Brooks Falls, Lake Clarke National Park, and Katmai National Park to explore the rich biodiversity of these wild landscapes. Wildlife-based tourism in these areas provides long-term, renewable economic benefits that far outweigh the short-term gains of a bear or wolf hunt.

Beyond the economics, these animals are integral to Alaska’s cultural heritage and ecological identity. For Indigenous communities and many residents, bears and wolves hold spiritual and cultural significance, representing ancestral connections to the land, traditional knowledge systems, and deep respect for nature. They are also vital to ecosystem health, playing crucial roles in nutrient cycling and population regulation.

Permitting predator hunts along the borders of these protected areas—especially where bears and wolves are habituated to human presence—jeopardizes the very wildlife experiences that draw people to these locations. The McNeil River, Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge bears, for instance, are globally celebrated for their unique, non-aggressive behavior developed over decades of protected status. Allowing nearby hunting not only undermines this rare dynamic, but also threatens the credibility of Alaska’s wildlife management practices.

I urge the Board to take a forward-looking approach and protect the economic and cultural value of these apex predators by rejecting any expansion of hunting near these key conservation areas. These landscapes—and the magnificent creatures they support—deserve policies rooted in stewardship, science, and sustainability.

Thank you for considering this request. I respectfully ask you to preserve what makes Alaska extraordinary for future generations.

Sincerely,

Dr. Sharon Weicman

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/19F7dtGpBk/?mibextid=wwXIfr>

---

**Name:** Weiss, Cal

**Community of Residence:** Monterey

**Comment:**

I’m highly disgusted with this inhumane action of slaughtering poor bears they haven’t done anything wrong

---





**Name:** Wells, Heather

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla

**Comment:**

Date: 07.07.2025

To: The Alaska Board of Game

Subject: Opposition to Proposal 1

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Game,

Today I write to you to express my strong opposition to Proposal 1, which seeks to add black and brown bears to the Mulchatna Predator Control Plan.

I am deeply concerned that this program, which permits the aerial shooting of bears and the killing of cubs and sows, undermines the ethical standards and scientific principles that should guide wildlife management. Predator control of this magnitude, especially with limited supporting data and uncertain outcomes, risks damaging the integrity of Alaska's ecosystems and reputation as a leader in conservation-based tourism.

In Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (ADF&G) Proposed Regulatory Changes accompanying this proposal, the Department states that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area encompasses approximately 39,683 square miles, and that multiple predator control areas may be utilized within the management area. This ~40,000 square mile control area is:

50 miles from McNeil River State Game Sanctuary

30 miles from Katmai National Park

3 miles from Lake Clark National Park and Preserve

While brown bear home ranges can be quite large, the average is between 50 and 150 square miles. Thus, the iconic bears that are marketed for viewing around the world at McNeil and Brooks Falls very feasibly travel into this proposed Control Area and would be subject to aerial gunning. My grandchildren are beside themselves, worried the bears they know and have studied in school that live in all the proposed areas could be gunned down and killed. Leaving nothing to show they even existed but a hide for the trappers to auction off. I worry about the youth and future generations of Alaskans. Will slaughtering animals cruelly en masse become the norm of society? What kind of message does this unscientific, unsupported, barbaric plan send to the public? How can completely wiping out multiple generations of bear families be allowed or justified? How will we save our incredible, diversified, pristine ecosystem from collapse without the support of our Apex predators?

According to a study by the University of Alaska Fairbanks, bear tourism in Southcentral Alaska generated \$34.5 million in 2017 alone 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. At a time when State and Federal

budgets are being slashed, we should be protecting the wildlife assets in our state, not spending hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to gun them down. Many Alaskans have built their businesses catering to visitors who want to see bears and wolves in the Alaskan wilderness. What happens to their livelihood? How will they continue to support their families?

The assumption that bear predation is the primary driver of the Mulchatna caribou herd's decline is not conclusively supported by the available research. Singularly targeting predators may yield short-term gains at the cost of long-term ecological and reputational harm.

Furthermore, I feel this process lacks good faith and transparency. Holding this meeting in the middle of the busy summer season when most Alaskans are unavailable to comment does not solicit meaningful public engagement. Further, there is an unsettling lack of transparency around where aerial gunning would take place within the control area and how many bears would be killed under this plan. It is my understanding that, if this proposal passes, ADF&G could create a bear culling program anywhere within the 40,000 square mile control area until 2028 without any further public input.

I urge the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game to reconsider this policy and to pursue alternatives rooted in sound science, stakeholder collaboration, and respect for the diverse economic and cultural values Alaskans and our visitors hold for wildlife.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Heather Wells



**Name:** Welsh, Jennifer

**Community of Residence:** United States

**Comment:**

I am greatly opposed to the hunting of the Brown Bears. Please keep them as a protected species. They are valuable to the ecosystem and amazing animals. I have watched them on webcams for years and hope to travel to Alaska someday to see.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Welsh

---



PC1453

**Name:** Wemyss-Dunn, Charlie **Affiliation:** Preservation of At-risk Wildlife (PAW) foundation

**Community of Residence:** Massachusetts

**Comment:**

Dear Board of Game,

I strongly stand against this proposal to cull brown and black bears in Mulchatna. I believe this proposal will have a very detrimental impact on the bears of Katmai and Lake Clark national parks and that the policy is without proper scientific backing. These areas draw in a very large number of Americans each year to view bears, contributing a large amount of dollars to the Alaskan economy, and this policy risks hindering or damaging that critical revenue stream. In the face of overwhelming public opposition, please do not move forward with this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Charlie Wemyss-Dunn

---



PC1454

**Name:** Wenneson , Jill

**Community of Residence:** Cottonwood Heights

**Comment:**

I OPPOSE legalized game hunting of bears (or any game) from helicopters. This method of hunting is inhumane, unnecessary, and poses significant ethical and ecological problems.

Concerns about helicopter-assisted bear hunting include:

**Inhumane Treatment of Animals:** Hunting bears from helicopters is inherently cruel and causes unnecessary suffering. It often results in prolonged chases and injuries, leading to a slow and painful death for the animal.

**Disruption of Ecosystems:** The mass killing of predators like bears, especially with the potential to reduce populations significantly, can disrupt the natural balance of the ecosystem. Studies indicate this practice may not effectively increase populations of prey animals like moose and caribou and can have unintended consequences for the overall environment.

---



PC1455

**Name:** Wereta, Danette

**Community of Residence:** New Zealand

**Comment:**

I strongly oppose the practice of shooting bears from the air. This method of killing is cruel, indiscriminate, and lacks scientific evidence to support its effectiveness in achieving any meaningful conservation or population management outcomes.

Bears do not understand or adhere to human-imposed boundaries. They move freely across landscapes, meaning any attempt to control populations by aerial slaughter is not only ineffective but risks wiping out entire local groups, including cubs, without addressing the root causes of human-wildlife conflict.

This practice prioritizes convenience over ethics and ignores non-lethal alternatives that respect the lives of these intelligent, sentient beings. We must move toward evidence-based, humane approaches to coexistence with wildlife—not fall back on outdated and brutal tactics.

I urge you to reject aerial bear shooting and instead invest in long-term, science-driven solutions that protect both people and animals.

This would stop me being a tourist.



PC1456

**Name:** Werezak, Bonnie

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

PLEASE do not cull any of these beautiful bears.



PC1457

**Name:** Westhoff, Gen

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

This type of animal control is cruel, basically murder, unnecessary, & behind in the times. These bears deserve to be left alone and people need to be more aware of their existence. Mother Nature takes care of herself. Helicopters have no place in nature for this purpose, period! The individuals shooting these animals need therapy.



PC1458

**Name:** Wetzel, Stephanie

**Community of Residence:** Berlin, Germany

**Comment:**

Dear Sirs, there is no scientific evidence, that decimating bears helps the caribou. Any severe interference with nature should be avoided if there's no scientific proof that it is for the better.

Thank you, kind regards Stephanie Wetzel

---



**Name:** Wheeler, Roger

**Community of Residence:** Tennessee

**Comment:**

Please don't destroy our wildlife. Save them for our children and grandchildren. It's not to late

---



**Name:** Wheeler, Vickie

**Community of Residence:** Knoxville Tennessee

**Comment:**

This is the craziest thing I've ever heard. Why Why Why. Please don't do this.

---



**Name:** White, Lauren

**Community of Residence:** England

**Comment:**

As someone who has travelled to Alaska specifically to see its natural beauty (landscape and wildlife - including bears) I find this so disheartening.

Where is the science, the evidence? Please rethink.

---



**Name:** White, Tyler

**Community of Residence:** South Jordan, UT

**Comment:**

Please trust and invest in science instead of aimlessly killing bears in hopes that it will strengthen the caribou population.

If after scientific research it is necessary to eliminate some of the bears then it would be lucrative to have more hunts which can ensure the right bears are taken, not sows with cubs, etc. plus that would offer more income for the state.

---



**Name:** Whitley, Bella

**Community of Residence:** Arizona

**Comment:**

Please stop the unjust slaughter of bears, which is enacted with no scientific basis for benefiting wildlife. These animals are vital to the ecosystem and intelligent, meaningful creatures who are completely innocent. Killing them is achieving nothing but suffering, so I urge those responsible to please stop this cruelty immediately!

---



**Name:** Whitmire, Elizabeth

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage

**Comment:**

Stop killing all the bears without evidence of Benefit, without tracking, and without any type of preservation in mind. Slot Especially miles from reservations or wilderness they're allowed. They don't know the difference

---



**Name:** Whittaker, Heather

**Community of Residence:** Tennessee

**Comment:**

I am opposed to this. There is no evidence that this would help the herd. And it is clear that it will devastate the beauty of the bears. We must use our minds and find another solution.

---



**Name:** Whitten, Kenneth

**Community of Residence:** Fairbanks

**Comment:**

My name is Ken Whitten, and I have lived in Fairbanks AK since 1971. I am representing myself. My email address is kwhitten89@gmail.com.

I received a Master's degree from UAF in 1975 and worked for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game from 1975 to 2000. During most of my career with Fish and Game I was a Caribou research biologist working on the Central Arctic and Porcupine Caribou Herds. I also spent brief periods working on the Fortymile Herd and as acting Area Management Biologist for GMUs 26B and C. In my last few years with Fish and Game I was the Research Coordinator for Region III. I helped with the 1999 Mulchatna

Herd photocensus and wrote a chapter on Caribou for the book Bristol Bay Alaska—Natural Resources of the Aquatic and Terrestrial Ecosystems. I have hunted Mulchatna Caribou.

I am opposed to reauthorizing the current IM program for Mulchatna Caribou. The Courts have already found that the current program was adopted without adequate public notification and did not meet constitutional standards for insuring sustained yield of bears. There is no new data on bears in any of the documents referenced in the online notice for the July 2025 Board Meeting. If the Department presents new data at the meeting, the public will have had no opportunity to review it. Based on misstatements and unsupported conclusions by the Department in previous Board meetings, the inability for the public to review or comment on new information is a serious flaw in the Board process.

Most of the supposed urgency for addressing an “emergency” situation regarding the Mulchatna Herd stems from IM population and harvest goals that are not being met. The current goals are unrealistic and should be revised before any further predator reductions are considered, let alone reauthorized. Even the Department’s 2024 Mulchatna Caribou Herd Photo Survey memorandum states that “It may be appropriate to consider revising the current population objective of 30,000-80,000 given historic and recent population trends.” This memorandum was available before the March 2025 Board meeting, yet revising the IM goals was not addressed in Department testimony.

Also at the March 2025 Board meeting, department biologists testified that Mulchatna Caribou are in good shape nutritionally and the habitat should be able to support more caribou. Yet the 2024 MCH Spring Intensive Management Activities memorandum (also available but not discussed at the March 2025 meeting) found extensive evidence of stillbirths, malnutrition, dehydration, mineral deficiencies, and “failure to thrive.”

I submit that the Board should delay any decision to reauthorize predator reductions and should instead schedule another meeting to discuss revising the IM goals.

In addition, the Department’s justification for predator reductions, particularly for bears, is faulty on many levels and Department officials have misinterpreted data and reached conclusions not supported by their own data. For example, Figures 20-22 in the Mulchatna Caribou herd presentation - March 2025 (one of the documents made available in the announcement for this Board meeting) show calf mortality data for East and West herd segments combined. Combining the data while promoting a critical need for reducing bear predation in the Western herd segment is misleading. Figures 4 and 5 in the Operational Plan for Intensive Management of Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) in Game Management Units 9b, 17, 18, And 19b During Regulatory Years 2018–2024, show that presenting data for each herd segment separately presents a very different picture. Collared calf survival to 2 weeks in the West was about the same or higher than in the East in 6 of 7 years between 2011 and 2022. Mean 2-week survival in the West was 71% versus 56% in the East. The percent of collared calves killed by bears was lower in the West in 5 of 7 years. The Operational Plan also reported that survival of collared calves to 4 months ranged from 38 to 91% in the West versus 25-78% in the East. Thus, 2-week survival (when bears might potentially be a factor) as well as survival to fall were actually higher and bear predation was lower in the West than in the East. Therefore, consistently lower fall calf:cow ratios in the West compared to the East cannot be attributed to bear predation on the calving grounds. The decision to remove bears on the Western calving grounds was in fact contraindicated by available data.

Nevertheless, the Department removed bears (and wolves) in 2023 and 2024. Collared calf survival in the West was high in 2024, and calf:cow ratios in the West increased in 2023 and 2024, leading the Department to conclude that bear removals benefitted caribou. However, correlation does not prove causation. Early calf survival in the West was comparably high in several years before bear removal

without leading to high fall ratios. The apparent correlation thus disappears when viewed over a longer time period, suggesting instead that something other than predation on the Western calving grounds caused low fall calf:cow ratios prior to 2023

The Department has also attributed apparent Mulchatna Herd population growth to bear removals in the West. However, the 2024 Mulchatna Caribou Herd Photo Survey memorandum states that higher counts in 2024 were likely due at least in part to better counting conditions. When broken down by herd segment, the 2024 population estimate for the Western segment was not statistically different from the 2023 estimate. The 2024 estimate in the East was significantly higher than in 2023 but, again, might have been due to better count conditions. The data strongly suggest that if any caribou population growth occurred in 2024, it was in the East and cannot have been due to bear removals in the West.

I would also argue that the Proposed Regulatory Changes to 5 AAC 92.111 by ADF&G are unacceptable. Population goals for bears and wolves are non-quantitative and essentially say that wolves and bears would be killed annually until the expected result of improvement in caribou population dynamics is achieved. That's hardly a scientific or objective statement.

Conditions for the Commissioner to review, modify, or suspend program activities are ludicrous. Conditions A and F are impossible to meet within the time frame of the regulation. B and G make no sense—the population goals for wolves and bears are to keep killing them until a hoped-for response in caribou occurs.

Condition C doesn't consider that the caribou population could increase in the portion of the herd not subject to bear removals. There could be no response in the bear removal area, as in 2024, but an increase in the other herd segment. Growth in the East cannot justify further bear removal in the West.

There is already evidence of significant nutritional stress in Caribou (Condition E).

Condition D does not recognize that factors other than predation could affect fall calf:cow ratios.

In conclusion, the Board needs to postpone any decision to reauthorize the Mulchatna IM program. Instead, IM population and harvest goals should be reconsidered. The Board or Department should solicit an outside peer review of Mulchatna area caribou and predator data and management plans. The Department needs to do a better job of informing the Board and the Public, rather than selectively presenting findings that support what seems to be a predetermined decision. Spending large sums of money in a controversial effort to reduce predation is ill advised if the need for the reduction can't be fully and unequivocally justified and especially if other factors are what's really driving herd dynamics. There should be more effort in determining what those other factors might be.

---

**Name:** Whittington, Jane

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I am making this simple. PLEASE do not allow bears to be shot from the air. I do not even understand why this is happening anywhere on the planet.

---





**Name:** Wieslander, Janice

**Community of Residence:** Iowa

**Comment:**

This is disgraceful!

---



**Name:** Wiis, Janni

**Community of Residence:** Denmark

**Comment:**

As long as there's no scientific, biological and genetic benefits of this regulation in the bear population in Alaska. I Janni Wiis, formally conclude with my zookeeper and biodiversity manager degrees, that this is a senseless homicide on bears within breeding/cub season, and should be stopped immediately!

Feel free to contact me anytime if you need someone to speak further on the matter!

Kind regards

Janni Wiis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---



**Name:** Wilcox, Danielle

**Community of Residence:** Canada

**Comment:**

This comment is clearly going to be in opposition of this aerial program, as I'm not sure how anyone in their right mind would support this. These are innocent animals that we're talking about, so I can't believe this is even up for discussion... considering that the slaughtering of these animals does nothing for Caribou populations. So what is this for? A psychotic obsession with killing? Shooting these gorgeous animals from a helicopter.... How very Donald Trump of you Alaska. In a time when so much beauty in the world is in question, quite literally in danger, of being stripped from us, you want to shoot mass amounts of bears? An animal that is such a symbol of your state. A symbol of the natural beauty it possesses. I strongly urge anyone with a conscience to vote this down. Anyone with children whose future we are heavily influencing. Anyone who gives a damn. Vote this down.

---



**Name:** Wiles, Seth

**Community of Residence:** Boone

**Comment:**

These bears represent the beauty and majesty of Alaska's wildlife, and killing them in this abhorrent and widespread manner should be illegal. Every animal has its part in an ecosystem, and these animals are essential to maintaining the Alaskan biosphere. Stop this unjust and destructive killing.

---



**Name:** Wilkerson, James

**Community of Residence:** Wasilla AK

**Comment:**

I support reduction when needed to many bears will cause the calf's of moose and injure or kill more people when over populated bears compete for the food

---



**Name:** Wilkie, Lindsay

**Community of Residence:** Tennessee

**Comment:**

SAVE THE BEARS. Please consider other ways to support one animal population without targeting and killing another.

---



**Name:** Wilkinson, Keith

**Community of Residence:** Bryn Mawr

**Comment:**

I am in opposition of this regulation. Eliminating a capstone species is not sound management. As someone who has experienced the beauty and power of Alaska's bears firsthand, they not only keep the balance of the local ecology in check, but they bring millions of dollars of revenue from the state of Alaska from tourists visiting solely for the experience of seeing bears in the wild. Historically, eliminating key predatory species leads to overpopulation and worse health overall for other species in their food chain due to greater competition for resources. Balance means healthy and abundant prey & predator alike.

---



**Name:** Willems, Reen

**Community of Residence:** Alberta

**Comment:**

My answer will not be a long , who is their right mind would destroy these creatures !!! They have every right to be living on this land , people are the intruders!!! 100 % do not support harming these bears , don't you darn touch a hair on them!!

---



**Name:** Williams , Karen

**Community of Residence:** USA

**Comment:**

I understand the concern about the decline of the caribou herd however, this is all nature and wildlife survival. I would think that the hunting by locals is part of the cause as well not just bears and wolves. There's plenty of other food sources without the killing of all of these animals. How about putting limits on the killing of caribou by locals. Just leave bears and wolves alone, they are being wild animals. Who are we to kill them because they are doing what they need to survive. I'm sorry the caribou are declining but look at who else is killing them and stop it.

---



**Name:** Williams , Laura

**Community of Residence:** Davenport Iowa

**Comment:**

Please save the bears! My grandchildren and there children should be able to see nature! Government is trying to remove every type of nature. From wild horses,donkeys, bears, wolf's. God created everything leave it alone.

---



**Name:** Williams , Lorene

**Community of Residence:** Bandon Oregon

**Comment:**

Please save the bears. This is an abomination. We are losing wildlife at an alarming rate. Alaska should be a safe place.

---



PC1479

**Name:** Willoughby, Andrea

**Community of Residence:** Los Angeles

**Comment:**

Even though I live in Los Angeles, California, I strongly oppose the proposed regulation by the Alaska Board of Game to allow department staff to kill brown and black bears in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Area. This kind of large-scale predator control is a short-sighted and inhumane approach that ignores the complex ecological relationships between species. Bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, and targeting them as scapegoats for caribou declines overlooks more significant factors like habitat degradation and overharvesting. Slaughtering native predators to artificially boost game populations sets a dangerous precedent and undermines science-based wildlife management.

---



PC1480

**Name:** Wilson , Sandy

**Community of Residence:** Oregon

**Comment:**

Please stop & do some studies to see the consequences from past killing. We can't have an ecosystem that's more screwed up from humans.

---



PC1481

**Name:** Wilson Austin , Nicola

**Community of Residence:** UK

**Comment:**

The Katmai bears bring such joy to people across the world and it is through them and the bear cameras that I have been researching Alaska and plan to visit, not just for the bears but to see what else Alaska has to offer. I don't pretend to understand how difficult it is to live alongside animals that pose a risk to human life so I won't pretend that I do however if there are other ways I ask that they are explored. The bears are worth so much to the great state of Alaska and rightly or wrongly people have named them and love them, they settle Alaska into people's hearts whoever never set foot there but hope one day to do so. I implore you to consider other options if possible. I trust that the right decision will be made for the people and the bears. Thank you.

---



PC1482

**Name:** Wilson McPhail, Emily

**Community of Residence:** Obetz

**Comment:**

This is inhumane and unnecessary.

---



**Name:** Wilson, Morgan

**Community of Residence:** Salt lake Utah

**Comment:**

It's a disgrace what humans are doing to the world and wild life. Breaks my heart for these amazing animals.

---



**Name:** Wines, Ashley

**Community of Residence:** Whatcom

**Comment:**

Stop killing the bears!

---



**Name:** Wood, Allison

**Community of Residence:** Elgin, Texas

**Comment:**

reintroduction of wolves, has proven how important each animal is to the ecosystem

Bears travel large distances and may exit Katmai to travel to / from denning. It's important to maintain the area's ecosystem. Allowing hunting that close to Katmai could disrupt the park's ecosystem. The park brings in large amount of tourist money to the area. People come to see specific bears

Important to protect natural resources in the area for future generations

---



**Name:** Wood, Maureen Benedict Ange Wood

**Community of Residence:** Vancouver

**Comment:**

ALL HUMANS SHOULD AND HAVE TO PROTECT ALL ANIMALS [REDACTED] HUMANS AGAINST HUMANS IS ON THE BREAK OF WAR

---



**Name:** Woodbury, Michelle

**Community of Residence:** Sacramento, CA

**Comment:**

I, like many others who support evidence based policies, strongly oppose the unnecessary and despicable proposed regulation. This is not only an incredibly unproven method, but would also be futile as this is far from a 1:1 predator/prey scenario. Quit meddling in things with such a lackluster understanding of them, especially when it could potentially result in the murder of innocent, beloved, needed beings.

---



**Name:** Woods, April

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage, Alaska

**Comment:**

I have zero expectations that our horrible "Board of Game" will make a good decision about the bears in Mulchatna. Why? Because they always fail to protect nature and wildlife. For decades now I've tried to get the board of game to make decisions for life and they have failed, over and over again. I've had to conclude, they are all hunters who have no heart or brain to care for the living creatures of Alaska, all they see is a target to kill and/or money to be made selling a hunting license to the next killer in line. No wonder all of Alaska's wildlife numbers continue to decrease. The good old days of seeing moose every where in Alaska are over cuz the Board of Shame did wrong by them and all other living creatures. The Board of Game is the problem, always has been and meanwhile our wildlife numbers will continue to decrease and go into extinction and they can care a less but I do, so I write PLEASE STOP KILLING ALL ANIMALS with four legs.

---



**Name:** Woods, Breanna

**Community of Residence:** Las Vegas

**Comment:**

ave the bears 🐻💔

My heart aches knowing that innocent bears — including mothers and their cubs — are being gunned down from helicopters. These are living, breathing beings who roam freely, raise families, and play a vital role in nature.

They don't know borders. They don't know they've stepped into a kill zone. And now, they're being wiped out — erased — for no proven benefit.

This isn't conservation. It's cruelty.

These bears are not just wildlife — they are part of Alaska's soul, and a wonder the world flies across the globe to witness.

We cannot stay silent. Please stop this senseless killing. 🐻🙏

#SaveTheBears #LetThemLive #EndAerialHunting

**PC1490****Name:** Wooster, Susan**Community of Residence:** Albany, NY**Comment:**

Killing wildlife should be illegal!

---

**PC1491****Name:** Worzalla, Kaitlin**Community of Residence:** Annapolis, MD**Comment:**

I oppose the inhumane hunting of bears and wolves and urge the voting members to ensure this program does not continue. Bears and wolves are the iconic megafauna of Alaska that were at the heart of my time in the state. As an environmental science major, I understand the complex ecosystem and food chain interactions. I want the caribou to be able to thrive too, but I don't see the statistics and scientific evidence that truly prove this method is successfully restoring the caribou population. Furthermore, the locations of these hunts needs to be reevaluated for proximity to protected habitats and impacts therein. Bears and wolves don't understand where the safe space starts or ends. Killing one that is single digits of miles outside the boundary is unfair, unethical, and immoral. We need to have better methods of deciding which bear to kill if we're going to kill them. A mother bear with cubs? Seriously? That is unacceptable. Finally, I understand that the regions of predator control are remote and it would be inefficient to use other methods. However, hunting from a helicopter is unethical, traumatizing, and inconsiderate to all animals that call this space home. Find a different way. We are better than this!

---

**PC1492****Name:** Wylie , Greg**Community of Residence:** Sioux Falls**Comment:**

Bears are in their environment, we've invaded their space.

---

**PC1493****Name:** Xhaferri, Marildo**Community of Residence:** New York**Comment:**

DO NOT KILL THE BEARS.

---



**Name:** Yacyshyn, Max

**Community of Residence:** Florida

**Comment:**

It is not human's rights to kill species when they are not invasive. Nature will take care of itself. There is no need or point in us pretending to play god.

---



**Name:** Yap, Chada

**Community of Residence:** Singapore

**Comment:**

Please stop the killing of the bears in Alaska. Please find a better way to manage their population, not just an easy way out. Thank you for your kind consideration.

---



**Name:** Yarnell, Katherine

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

Opposition to Proposal 1 – Predator Control in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Area

I strongly oppose Proposal 1, which seeks to reinstate the Department of Fish and Game's authority to lethally remove brown and black bears as part of the Intensive Management (IM) plan for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd (MCH).

This proposal is deeply flawed in its assumptions, unscientific in its long-term outlook, and ecologically damaging in its execution.

#### 1. Killing Bears to Benefit Caribou Is Scientifically Questionable and Ethically Problematic

Numerous peer-reviewed studies have cast serious doubt on the long-term effectiveness of predator control programs that involve the lethal removal of bears. While calf survival may increase temporarily, there is little evidence that these actions lead to sustained herd recovery without addressing broader ecological issues such as habitat degradation, climate change, and disease—all of which also impact caribou populations.

Moreover, indiscriminately killing bears, which are slow-reproducing, long-lived animals, undermines the ecological balance and disrespects the intrinsic value of these iconic species.

#### 2. The Court Vacated This Portion of the Program for a Reason

In March 2025, the Alaska Superior Court vacated the bear-killing portion of this program. Attempting to circumvent this ruling by reintroducing the same policy is not only disrespectful to the legal process, it

risks undermining public trust in wildlife governance. The Court found the program unjustified—why should the Board now approve the same flawed plan under a new wrapper?

### 3. This Is Not True “Intensive Management”—It’s Predator Blaming

Proposal 1 focuses heavily on predator removal while downplaying or ignoring the complex, multi-factor causes of caribou decline. This includes overhunting in earlier years, habitat fragmentation, changing migration patterns, and climate-driven food shortages.

Alaska’s Intensive Management law mandates that the state sustain populations for human harvest—but this should not be used as a blank check to eliminate natural predators without sound justification. True management must consider long-term sustainability and healthy ecosystem function, not just maximizing one species for human use.

### 4. The Ecosystem Cannot Be “Micro-Managed” Without Consequences

Targeting a small percentage of the herd’s range (1.8%) for intensive predator killing may sound reasonable, but wildlife do not operate in fixed zones. Bears and wolves roam across vast landscapes and killing them in one area disrupts social structures and movement patterns far beyond that boundary.

Furthermore, department-led predator control sets a dangerous precedent. If the state begins routinely eliminating bears to inflate game populations, it threatens the integrity of Alaska’s entire wildlife management philosophy and endangers the long-term viability of apex predator populations.

### 5. Public Values Are Changing—So Should Management

Alaskans value their bears—not only as part of healthy ecosystems but as cultural and economic assets, especially in tourism and wildlife photography. Slaughtering them for the sake of marginal caribou gains does not reflect modern public values and alienates residents and visitors who cherish Alaska’s wild character.

### In Conclusion

Proposal 1 is not a solution—it’s a short-sighted, reactionary measure that favors outdated predator-control ideology over science-based conservation. Instead of targeting bears and wolves, the state should invest in rigorous habitat monitoring, non-lethal wildlife management tools, and broader ecosystem health strategies that address all the factors behind caribou decline.

I urge the Board to reject this proposal and uphold responsible, ethical, and ecologically informed wildlife stewardship.

Respectfully submitted,

Katie Yarnell

Human. Not above nature—part of it.

---



**Name:** Yates, Ann

**Community of Residence:** Anchorage AK

**Comment:**

I am writing to oppose the Mulchatna Bear Control Program consisting of shooting healthy bears from the air to mass kill and/or wound them and leave them to die in the name of protecting the Mulchatna caribou herd. Yet science does not show it's the predators like the bears that are the main threat to the caribou (and let's not forget that bears and caribou have been living together and effectively managing their populations without man's help for many years). The man threat is climate change which has reduced the main food of the caribou which is lichen and growing in its place are shrubs that do not sustain caribou. In addition, the caribou herd is weakened by disease and would actually benefit from having the sick and dying caribou removed by the bears.

Why would we kill a healthy animal that is iconic to Alaska, that actually represents the big, beautiful wildness of our state? How does that possibly help the bears, the caribou, residents of Alaska or tourism? It doesn't. It's a lose-lose for all involved and is a very sad and ugly presentation of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

I hope you'll listen to science and logic and the heart of Alaska. Ann Yates

---



**Name:** Yates, Honey

**Community of Residence:** France

**Comment:**

No animal should be killed from a helicopter

---



**Name:** Yazhi, Sal **Affiliation:** RAICES.UCLA (ROOTS)

**Community of Residence:** UCLA

**Comment:**

Asan indigenous man of the Diné tribe we honor all life and right to live. We are all related with all elements, nature and all living beings human or not .

---



PC1500

**Name:** Yokoyama, Jane

**Community of Residence:** Asheville

**Comment:**

As an Alaska resident of 35 years, I was shocked to hear about the indiscriminate killing of bears. As a former science teacher in Alaska I taught my students to value nature and understand the delicate balance in our environment. As a recent visitor to Katmai I appreciate the beauty of bears and know we can live safely in their midst as long as we understand how to interact. There is no science to justify this policy.

Needless to say I oppose the policy of killing brown and black bears when one does not even know how this will impact the caribou herd.

Thank you.

---



PC1501

**Name:** Yumanova , Alexandra

**Community of Residence:** Virginia

**Comment:**

Please save these precious animals. They are vital to nature

---



PC1502

**Name:** Zaidi, Aliya

**Community of Residence:** India

**Comment:**

This is animal cruelty and not acceptable

---



PC1503

**Name:** Zeigler , Michelle

**Community of Residence:** Hawaii

**Comment:**

Killing bears or any species is outrageous and it must not happen again.

---



**Name:** Zendejas, Kassandra

**Community of Residence:** Alaska

**Comment:**

Please do more research before killing innocent animals who are only hunting in their home. Bears are an important part of the food chain. Nature takes care of itself it doesn't need help from humans. Please don't try to play GOD

---



**Name:** Zink, Spencer

**Community of Residence:** Colorado

**Comment:**

I oppose the take of brown and black bears because there is no scientific evidence that killing predators helps caribou herds. Additionally, as a Non-Alaskan, I understand that Alaska is known for its pristine natural environments and scenes. Bears in other areas of North America are not doing as well as bears in Alaska. This provides an industry of eco-tourism as well as a basis of naturalism to maintain. Areas in other states have already been developed and medeled with enough that their pristine natural environments no longer exist. Even if you do not care for naturalism, bears, such as those that inhabit Brooks Falls, bring tourists from all over the world. This boosts the economy, provides tourism jobs, and helps businesses in the area. If these environments are changed, the economy will hurt, the environment will hurt, and the beauty of the area will hurt. I oppose the take of brown and black bears.

---



**Name:** Zuluaga, Valentina

**Community of Residence:** CA

**Comment:**

Bears are a very important part of the ecosystem, there is no scientific data that backs up the claim that culling bears helps Caribou. This is extremely inhumane to just be killing bears for sport, they are an integral part of the ecosystem, and human intrusion into it disturbs and disrupts the food chain and the regular interaction between animals and their environment.

---



June 23, 2025

To: Board of Game (Meeting 7-14-2025)  
RE: SAAC 92.11 - Intensive Management Plans,  
Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management  
Area

Name: Terry Cummings, [REDACTED]  
Resident of Anchorage (since 1963), 99504

I am submitting comments on behalf of Myself.

Email - [REDACTED]

### Comments:

I am in opposition to SAAC 92.11 - Intensive Management Plans, Mulchatna Caribou Herd Predation Management Area.

Bears are not responsible for the decline of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Disease, food availability, climate change, over hunting, natural fluctuations, too liberal hunting regulations, are the major causes, as scientifically established. ADF&G doesn't even know how many bears are in the area and state that killing all the bears "likely" would be effective.

Bears are the slowest reproducing mammals



(Outside of Meek Ox) in North America:  
Sustainability of the population is not being considered. Killing the bears is actually bringing other bears into the area from miles away, to feed on the dead ones. That is illegal bear baiting. It is scientifically proven that killing predators to increase moose and caribou numbers does not work. Chasing bears with helicopters & motorized vehicles is inhumane.

Killing females (and cubs) leaves no sustainability. Females do not breed every year (usually 3 to 4 years) and have only a couple of cubs, of which only 50% survive. They are very slow at reproducing.

Predators are essential for a healthy caribou herd. Eradicating all grizzlies is not good management. ADF & G ~~Doesn't~~ even know how many bears are in the management area. They don't know how many die of disease, food availability, how climate change affects them, etc. They assume a lot. "Likely" is just guessing.

The people of Alaska do not want these bears killed.

- Going to see these bears was on my bucket list -
  - Won't be able to go now - I am strongly opposed to this proposal -
- Jerry Lemming 6/23/25