

**PROPOSAL 46A**

**5 AAC 92.200. Purchase and sale of game.**

(a) In accordance with AS 16.05.920(a) and 16.05.930(e), the purchase, sale, or barter of game or any part of game is permitted except as provided in this section.

(b) [EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN 5 AAC 92.031,] a person may not purchase, sell, advertise, or otherwise offer for sale:

(1) any part of a brown bear, except an article of handicraft made from the fur of a brown bear or a brown bear trophy;

[(2) A BIG GAME TROPHY, OR A BLACK BEAR TROPHY OF ANY KIND;]

(3) a big game animal skull, except a big game trophy or the skull of a black bear, wolf, or wolverine, or a horn or antler that is still attached to any part of the skull;

(4) the antler of a caribou taken in Unit 23, unless the antler is a naturally shed antler or has been made into an article of handicraft or a caribou trophy;

(5) unsealed marten taken in Units 1 - 7, and 15, except as provided in 5 AAC 92.170(a) ;

(6) unsealed beaver taken in Units 1 - 11 and Units 13 - 17;

(7) unsealed land otter, lynx, wolf, or wolverine;

(8) the meat of big game and small game, except hares and rabbits

(9) the gallbladder of a bear.

(c) A person may not barter, advertise for barter, or otherwise offer for barter:

(1) [A BIG GAME TROPHY, OR A BLACK BEAR TROPHY OF ANY KIND;]

(2) the antler of a caribou taken in Unit 23, unless the antler is a naturally shed antler or has been made into an article of handicraft or a caribou trophy;

(3) the gallbladder of a bear.

[(D)NOTWITHSTANDING (B)(2) AND (B)(3) OF THIS SECTION, A LICENSED TAXIDERMIST, ESTATE EXECUTOR, OR BANKRUPTCY REFEREE, MAY SELL A SKIN OR TROPHY BY PERMIT ISSUED UNDER 5 AAC 92.031, AND THE STATE WILL, IN ITS DISCRETION, SELL A SKIN OR TROPHY AS EXCESS PROPERTY. A PERSON MAY PURCHASE AND POSSESS AN ANIMAL SKIN OR TROPHY SOLD UNDER THIS SUBSECTION. HOWEVER, NO PERSON MAY RESELL A SKIN OR TROPHY PURCHASED FROM A SELLER UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.]

**5 AAC 92.031 Permit for selling skins and trophies.**

[(A) A LICENSED TAXIDERMIST MAY SELL AN UNCLAIMED, FINISHED SKIN OR TROPHY UNDER A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT AFTER THE FINISHED SKIN OR TROPHY HAS BEEN HELD UNCLAIMED FOR SIX MONTHS, AND AFTER THE TAXIDERMIST SENDS NOTICE OF INTENT TO SELL, BY REGISTERED MAIL AT LEAST 15 DAYS BEFORE THE SALE, TO THE LAST KNOWN ADDRESS OF THE PERSON WHO ORDERED THE TAXIDERMISTRY WORK.

(B) A COURT APPOINTED OR DULY AUTHORIZED ESTATE EXECUTOR, OR A REFEREE IN A BANKRUPTCY, MAY SELL A GAME SKIN OR TROPHY IN A BANKRUPTCY OR PROBATE ACTION IF THAT PERSON FIRST OBTAINS A PERMIT FROM THE DEPARTMENT.]

# RC76

## PROPOSAL 65A

**5 AAC 92.050. Required permit hunt conditions and procedures.**(a) The following conditions and procedures for permit issuance apply to each permit hunt:

...

(3) the applicant must obtain or apply for an Alaska **big game** hunting license before the time of permit application;

**Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee**  
**12 Dec 2011**

RC 77

**Proposal 93**

Motion: Nan Eagleson

Second: Brent Keith

Action: **Oppose** (Adopt: 1 Opposed: 8 Abstain: 1)

Description: Allow only the use of traps and snares for taking wolf and wolverine on National Park Service lands and prohibit the use of firearms except for dispatching trapped animals.

Amendment:

Discussion:

Paul Van Dyke – No distinction between state and fed  
Nan Eagleson – Federal lands set aside for different reason

**Proposal 101**

Motion: John Basile

Second: Paul Van Dyke

Action: **Adopt** (Adopt: 12 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0)

Description: Allow same day airborne taking of coyotes statewide.

Amendment:

Discussion:

P 184

**Proposal 102**

Motion Nan Eagleson

Second Paul Van Dyke

Action: **Adopt** (Adopt: 11 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 1)

Description: Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting goat or sheep.

Amendment:

Discussion:

**Proposal 104**

Motion: Nan Eagleson

Second: Brent Keith

Action: **Adopt** (Adopt: 12 Opposed: 0 Abstain: 0)

Description: Prohibit the use of deer or elk urine for use in taking game.

Amendment:

Discussion:

**Proposal 107**

Motion: Joe

Second: Wayne Walters

Action: **Oppose** (Adopt: 1 oppose: 8 Abstain: 1)

Description: Eliminate the statewide bag limit for black bear.

Amendment:

Discussion:

Nan Eagleson – Who makes the decision?

Joe – Decision needs to be made for each unit

Don Young- Few people are taking more than one bear

p28 4

**Proposal 109**

Action: **Oppose** (Adopt: 0 oppose: 12 Abstain: 0)

Description: Clarify and remove complicated and restrictive regulations and ADF&G discretionary provisions pertaining to black bear hunting.

Amendment:

Discussion:

107 takes care of 109

**Proposal 124**

Motion: Wayne Walters

Second: John Basile

Action: **Oppose** (Adopt: 1 oppose: 8 Abstain: 2)

Description: Require trap identification for all Units on lands managed by the National Park Service.

Amendment:

Discussion:

**Proposal 125**

Motion: Wayne Walters

Second: Brent Keith

Action: **Oppose** (Adopt: 1 oppose: 8 Abstain: 2)

Description: Require a 72 hour trap check for all traps and snares set on National Park Service lands.

Amendment:

Discussion:

John Basile – What about incimate weather

Wayne Walters – does this mean trappers need snogos to trap?

Nan Eagleson – Park Lands

**Proposal 128**

Motion Wayne Walters

Second: Joe

Action: **Adopt** (Adopt: 10 oppose: 0 Abstain: 1)

Description: Establish a tag and fee to allow trappers to retain incidental catch.

Amendment:

Discussion:

Wayne Walters – Eliminate the Burden on trapper

Joe – Eliminate paperwork

p 484

RC 78

To the BOG:

Proposals 124-128

I fully support bear trapping due to several reasons

- It greatly increases the moose calf survival rate
- It gives the ability for people- by not developing land to still be able to live from that land- both from trapping and eating bears, but also from the greater number of moose that have the ability to survive
- It helps people who are living in remote areas feel that they have more control over their lives by being able to live off of the land just that much better.

Thank you,

Bo Fay,  
Eagle, AK

To: Alaska Board of Game Comments  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game

RC 79

From: Daniel J. Coverdell, MD  
15217 Darby Rd  
Eagle River, AK 99577

Subject: Comments against Proposal 102

Dear Board Members,

I use both llamas and horses to hunt, scout, and pack in the Chugach Range. I would urge consideration of the following points:

- It is not uncommon for horses to cohabitate with llamas, sheep, and goats in domestic farms. Disease transmission among all domestic animals needs to be considered, especially considering that horse packing is much more common than other pack animals listed in Proposal 102.
- To date there is no evidence that disease carried by pack stock has impacted sheep or goat populations in Alaska.
- In the lower 48, the researchers are unable to pinpoint the source of the pneumonia that has caused massive die-off of sheep. It is not clear which pack animals, if any, are the source.
- This proposal is an overreaction in the absence of hard scientific data.
- This proposal is discriminatory against pack animals other than horses, despite the lack of proof. On the other hand we do know and have proof that horses leave a much greater impact on the Alaskan environment than other pack stock, such as goats and llamas.
- Obviously more study is need, but if there is sufficient concern that pack stock have potential to carry disease, then all pack stock (including horses) should be banned until it can be confirmed which is the source.
- Pack stock could be tested for the disease of concern which would be a more sensible and scientific approach, than outright banning with as little information as there is now.
- It appears that the proposer of this Proposal is a sheep hunting guide who uses horses in the Chugach State Park, raises questions of conflict of interest, and this is reflected in the nature of the proposal.

In summary, the proposal is premature, lacks scientific basis, is biased, and discriminatory.

Sincerely,



Daniel J Coverdell, MD



RC 80

Comment by Linda Nuechterlein – Opposition to Proposal 102

18920 Elnora Lane, Eagle River, Alaska 99577

I am opposed to **Proposal 102** – 5 AAC 92.085 which would “Prohibit the use of pack animals other than horses while hunting sheep or goat” for the following reasons:

- There is no evidence that disease carried by pack stock such as llamas has impacted sheep populations in Alaska. (Proposer also admits this.)
- I have been a llama owner for more than 20 years, and find that llamas are remarkably disease free.
- The impact of llamas to the environment is significantly less than that of traditional pack stock such as horses and mules.
- Very few people use llamas (or non-traditional pack stock) to hunt sheep so the impact is insignificant from that perspective.
- Recreational use of the ordinary Alaskan citizen to enjoy non-traditional pack stock should not be restricted to further the interests of the professional guiding community.
- Daniel Montgomery (proposer and professional guide) cites extensive studies that disease, primarily pneumonia, caused major die off events for wild sheep populations in the lower 48 states. After numerous web searches, I was not able to locate the Washington and Idaho studies he cites to support this. However, I did find some information that indicates that during 1979 – 1980 big horn sheep in California contracted pneumonia after associating with domestic sheep. I am not aware of anyone packing with domestic sheep in Alaska, and cannot imagine why anyone would want to.
- The proposer, an Alaska hunting guide, appears to be misinterpreting lower 48 studies, causing unnecessary alarm, and regulation for something that may not be a plausible concern to wild sheep populations in Alaska.
- Therefore, it is imperative that studies cited by the proposer be substantiated prior to the Board banning use of pack animals such as llamas. Furthermore, if these studies exist, they may not be applicable to Alaska.
- If the Board determines this is a credible concern, the following actions should be considered prior to implementing Proposal 102: (1) Conduct a third party review of relevant studies to determine credibility and scientific rigor; and (2) Consider implementing an Alaska specific study to ascertain whether claims made in Proposal 102 are scientifically sound.

RC 81

JANUARY 17, 2012

FROM: GREG ROZZICKA

I am withdrawing the request for further regulatory action as contained in RC 71 submitted yesterday, to specifically authorize the movement of a naturally dead animal fouse as bait within SAAC 92,210 (7).

In further consultation w/ staff present (mgmt, enforcement & legal) we find this already allowed by reference in 92,210 (8) through a permit issued under 92,040, ~~and~~ that provides for issuance of a permit to salvage (hence, move) a naturally dead animal for an appropriate use or purpose - that specifically includes use as bait.

Since I did encounter various levels of uncertainty (both previous & present) in bringing this issue forward, it may be beneficial & certainly reassuring - to get a brief statement of affirmation on point of record from Dept of Law &/or Enforcement Division regarding the matter.

Quyana for your consideration...

