

S

B

472

# SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 4/10/90

FURTHER:

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE: 4/20/90

The Finance Committee considered

SB 472

"An Act authorizing moose farming."

and recommended:

- replace with \_\_\_\_\_ CS \_\_\_\_\_  same title
- or adopt \_\_\_\_\_ CS \_\_\_\_\_  new title
- attached amendment(s)  technical title change (HB only)
- \_\_\_\_\_ letter of intent adopted

do pass

do not pass

no recommendation

individual recommendations

further referral to \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

APPROVES PREVIOUS:

fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Dept/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Dept/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

zero fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

zero fiscal note(s) DFSG 3/2/90

appropriation-no fiscal note

SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

*[Signature]*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*[Signature]*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*[Signature]*  
 \_\_\_\_\_

*[Signature]* NOTEC  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*[Signature]* (No Rec)  
 \_\_\_\_\_

1.

2.

Co-Chairs: Signatures and Recommendations

## FISCAL NOTE

**REQUEST:**

Revision Date: 2-12-90  
Title: An act authorizing moose farming  
Sponsor: Cornhill  
Requestor: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Affected: Fish and Game  
BRU: Wildlife Conservation  
Components: Wildlife Conservation

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUNDING:** (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0

**POSITIONS:**

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS :** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by Bruce Dinneford  
Division: Wildlife Conservation

Phone: 465-4190  
Date: 2-22-90

Approved by Commissioner: [Signature]  
Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 2 7 90

Distribution (by preparer):  
Legislative Finance  
Legislative Sponsor  
Requestor  
Office of Management and Budget  
Impacted Agency(ies)

BY SEN. COGHILL

1 IN THE SENATE

2

SENATE BILL NO. 472

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5

A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act authorizing moose farming."

7 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

8 \* Section 1. AS 16.40.010 is amended to read:

9

Sec. 16.40.010. DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS BUFFALO, MOOSE, AND MUSK

10

OXEN. Whenever it is determined by the department that a surplus

11

[EXISTS IN THE HERDS] of buffalo, moose, and musk oxen exists [UNDER

12

ITS CONTROL], the department may, under regulations adopted by it,

13

grant the surplus or portions of it to persons, groups, associations,

14

partnerships, or corporations for the purpose of raising and breeding

15

the animals as domestic stock for commercial purposes, or for scientific

16

and educational purposes. A person, group, association, partnership,

17

or corporation may receive animals only after proving to the

18

satisfaction of the department

19

(1) intent to raise and breed the animals; and

20

(2) possession of facilities for maintaining the animals

21

under positive control.

22

\* Sec. 2. AS 16.40.020 is amended to read:

23

Sec. 16.40.020. SALE OF MEAT. The sale of buffalo, moose, or

24

musk oxen meat resulting from the slaughter of animals obtained under

25

AS 16.40.010, or their offspring is authorized.

4/20/90

**Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Division of Wildlife Conservation**

**BRIEFING PAPER ON MOOSE FARMING**

SB 472 and HB 516 would amend AS 16.40.010 and AS 16.40.020 to allow moose to be raised as domestic animals for commercial purposes and allow meat from these animals to be sold. AS 16.40.010 allows the Department of Fish and Game to grant surplus buffalo or muskoxen to persons or groups for the purpose of raising and breeding these animals as domestic stock for commercial purposes. The proposed legislation would add moose to the species that could be granted to individuals for private ownership.

The Department of Fish and Game is opposed to SB 472 and HB 516 for biological, economic, and social reasons.

Wildlife Management Concerns

Moose are the most highly sought after game species by resident and nonresident hunters. About 7,500 to 8,000 moose are harvested each year by about 50,000 hunters. In 1989, drawing permit hunts were oversubscribed by more than 25,000 requests. Moose also provide a major food base for other important wildlife species. Tourists, photographers, and outdoor enthusiasts eagerly seek opportunities to observe moose.

The primary proponent of this legislation (Mr. Nick Columbo from Delta) has proposed capturing moose along the Alaska Railroad near Talkeetna as a source of moose for his commercial operation. He claims this would reduce the number of moose killed by trains. Several thousand moose occur in this area and it would be impossible to predetermine which moose might be killed by a train. Whether moose are killed by trains or removed to moose farms, the result is the same--fewer moose along the railroad corridor. Public demand for moose in this area (GMU 14A and 14B) is very high. The 1989 season for resident hunters was for 1 bull and lasted from 20 to 30 days. In GMU 14A, there was also a cow season by drawing permits; 12,500 hunters entered the drawing for 400 permits. Our records indicate that about 4,000 hunters pursued moose in these game management subunits during the 1989 season. These hunters harvested over 700 moose. Obviously, the demand for moose greatly exceeds the supply in this area. The same is true for nearly all other parts of Alaska.

Farming of moose will require large acreages. Mr. Columbo has requested a lease of 4,000 acres of state land near Delta for his operation. Fencing of this land would exclude its use by other moose and many other wildlife species. Also, predators such as grizzly bears, black bears, and wolves are common near Delta and most other places where game farming might occur. Conflicts

between a moose farm and predators are certain. Passage of this legislation and approval of Mr. Columbo's lease request would remove 4,000 acres of productive state-owned wildlife habitat from production of wildlife for general public use and enjoyment. Predator populations over a much larger area would likely be impacted.

The Department would be responsible for ensuring the general welfare and humane treatment of moose on farms because moose are classified as big game animals and the public expects us to ensure the humane treatment of all wildlife. The Alaska Zoo in Anchorage is a good example of where the public demanded Departmental oversight beyond required permit conditions. A large moose farm as envisioned by Mr. Columbo would pose several problems. Moose are not a herd animal. Cows with calves are solitary and other moose seldom occur in groups of more than 4 or 5. To place 100 plus moose into a 4,000-acre pasture will create aggressive behavior that could injure many animals. Such dense stocking rates could also cause disease problems and these diseases could be transmitted to wild moose or domestic species outside the enclosure.

A larger problem would be created by passage of HB 516/SB 472 when people use this legislation to own a few moose as a hobby or to promote their tourist business. Such road-side attractions are notorious for mistreatment of animals and Alaska has strictly prohibited such activity in the past. Individuals holding moose to promote their tourist trade will likely have no training in animal husbandry or knowledge of how to handle a large, wild animal. Even moose bottle-raised and accustomed to humans can become very aggressive and dangerous. The state may be held liable for allowing untrained people to hold wild animals if a moose injured someone.

Allowing the sale of moose meat will create serious law enforcement problems. Poaching of moose for commercial sale will become more common and difficult to enforce. Unethical moose farmers could work with poachers to confuse law enforcement. Allowing sale of moose meat will add an economic incentive to poachers that currently is absent. For this reason, in Alberta and several other provinces where elk farming is common, the sale of elk meat is prohibited. Farmers in Alberta can sell only antlers and breeding stock to other farms.

Current levels of wildlife law enforcement are inadequate to cope with this new burden. In West Germany, where sale of wildlife is legal, there are 65,000 armed wildlife protection agents (game wardens) or 1 for every 1.5 square miles (Geist 1988, Conservation Biology, 2(1):15-27). Still, poaching is considered a problem. In Alaska we have about 75 Fish and Wildlife Protection Officers plus about 300 employees of the Department of Fish and Game who are deputized. Counting even part-time deputized officers, this is 1 officer per 1,500 square miles of land. It is very unlikely that the level of law enforcement

would be raised to adequately enforce game regulations if sale of moose meat is allowed.

### Economic Reality

Moose are expensive to maintain in captivity. An average moose will consume 20 to 30 pounds of food per day in the summer and 10 to 12 pounds in the winter. The most productive areas in the state can support 6 to 8 moose per square mile during the winter. Mr. Columbo plans to stock in excess of 16 moose per square mile on his farm. A high level of supplemental feeding will be required. Moose have evolved to eat leaves and stems of woody plants. They cannot survive long-term on a diet which sustains cows, sheep, or horses. All moose held in captivity throughout the world are fed native browse or a pelleted ration that contains 33% aspen sawdust. This pelleted food is expensive, roughly twice the cost of domestic livestock feed.

Game farming has proven economical in some parts of Canada, most notably Alberta where elk and bison farms are common. However, none of these farms raise moose commercially because they are not profitable. A few farmers in Alberta do have 1 or 2 moose; the most owned by any one farmer is 6 animals. This farm is a wild animal park for tourists. No moose farms exist in the Yukon Territory.

The Yukon Territory, Department of Renewable Resources contracted with a private consulting firm in 1986 to analyze the economic feasibility of game ranching in the Yukon. This report concluded that moose are not suitable animals for game farming because of their tendency to acquire density-related disease. The Yukon government subsequently adopted a game ranching policy that prohibits the use of moose in game farming. The same report concluded that elk farming might be economically viable, but the average initial investment for an elk farm would be from \$400,000 to \$450,000 and annual operating costs would be \$17,000 to \$20,000, excluding labor. No income was predicted for the first 2 years of operation.

Moose farming is not economically feasible in areas where game farms have been established and much effort has been spent to establish markets for wild game products. To expect such endeavors to succeed in Alaska where no infrastructure exists and no market has been established is not realistic. The state has promoted agricultural projects in the past that resulted in continuing subsidies. We consider providing 100 publicly owned moose to private ownership a subsidy. Also, fencing 4,000 acres with a fence that will adequately enclose moose and exclude bison (a wild bison herd occurs in this area) will be very costly and could result in a request for a subsidy through a state loan.

Some proponents of moose farming have referred to reports from Russia where they think moose have been used successfully as work animals, for milk production, or for meat production. These

reports are not true. Russia initiated a large moose domestication project in the early 1940's. They built 2 large farms, one in the Pechora River Valley and one in central Siberia. Both farms closed in the mid-1960's because they were economic failures. It is difficult to obtain information on this project because the Soviets do not publicize their failures. However, moose specialists on our staff have obtained some scientific reports and have had several discussions with Soviet biologists who worked on the project. A synopsis of what we learned follows:

Moose could not be used for work animals except during winter. Moose do not have sweat glands, so working the moose during summer caused overheating and death. Milk production was low; to achieve a modest amount of production the moose had to be milked 6 times per day and labor costs were prohibitive. The Soviets learned they could produce as many moose through intensive management of wild animals as on the farms. They also had many behavior problems and had to hand-cut browse to feed the moose. The moose farm in the Pechora River Valley operates today as a field research center to study moose nutrition and physiology. The other farm was abandoned.

#### Social Considerations

Alaska's wildlife resources are a highly valuable economic asset. Wildlife contributes hundreds of millions of dollars annually to Alaska's economy through tourism, guiding, hunting, and subsistence. Tourists list the opportunity to see wildlife as their primary reason for visiting Alaska. The experience of observing wildlife will be diminished in value if tourists observe moose at road-side attractions and game farms.

The foundation of wildlife management in the United States is public ownership of the wildlife resource and a prohibition on commercial use (sale of meat or animal parts) of the wildlife resources. These 2 basic premises make it possible for most citizens to participate in hunting at a low cost and increase the desirability of wild meat because it can only be obtained through hunting. The use of wildlife in Europe has deteriorated, in large part, due to private ownership of game. Only about 3% of Europeans are hunters because costs are prohibitive and game meat can be purchased. Legalization of moose farms would start Alaska on a path to private hunting preserves and the European system of hunting. We strongly believe that such action would be a major error and would be detrimental to successful wildlife management in Alaska.



STATE OF ALASKA  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

BILL ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT Fish and Game	DIVISION Wildlife Conservation	BILL NUMBER SB 472	SPONSOR Coghill
SHORT TITLE OF BILL Moose Farming			
DEPARTMENT POSITION Opposed			
PREPARED BY Bruce Dinneford	DATE 3-05-90	COMMISSIONER'S SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE 3 7 90

SUMMARY

OTHER AGENCIES AFFECTED BY BILL Department of Public Safety, Commerce and Economic Development, Natural Resources	CONSTITUENT GROUP(S) AFFECTED BY BILL Hunters
ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR BILL Unknown	ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION TO BILL Unknown

FISCAL IMPACT:  NONE  FISCAL NOTE ATTACHED

BACKGROUND/LEGISLATIVE INTENT

SB 472 would authorize the transfer of moose into private ownership for the purpose of commercial raising and breeding and/or scientific and educational purposes. The sale of moose meat would be authorized.

ANALYSIS OF BILL/PROGRAM EFFECTS

This legislation goes against a basic Department and Division policy opposed to the private ownership of indigenous wildlife in Alaska. Commercialization of native wildlife is considered not to be in the best interest of the citizens of the state because of a) the possibility of transmission of disease to domestic and adjacent wild populations, which could affect subsistence and recreational hunting, and b) the probable increase in poaching such a law would encourage. It is highly unlikely that a surplus of moose will ever exist beyond a) the harvestable yield of a population, or b) the harvest desires of moose hunters. Enforcement of traffic in bootleg moose meat would be very difficult.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

None

PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR ANALYSIS.

**Tanya L Marsh  
1178 Nenana St  
Fairbanks, Ak. 99709  
474-0627**

**3444 Nowell Ave #D308  
Juneau, Ak. 99801  
463-5630**

**April 18, 1990**

**Alaska State Legislature  
Room 124 Capitol  
Juneau, Ak. 99811**

**To: All Senate Finance Committee Members,**

**In regards to SB 472, I would like to present an unpleasant vision that is entirely possible for the future if this bill for moose farming is allowed to pass.**

**Perhaps moose farming will begin as letting the moose roam in a fenced in lot with plenty of room to run and exercise their needs. However, after the demand for moose meat and hide grows, which would take almost no time at all, the moose would be confined to pens with out any consideration to their primal instincts and their sensitivity as a living being.**

**When cattle ranching first began in the 'Wild West' the cows were treated perhaps as humanely as possible for a creature born on death row. They had plenty of land to roam, and were even kept safe from predators.**

**Do you know how cows are raised now? Today? They are raised in factories-treated no more kindly than an assemblyman treats any given part of a car he is creating.**

**The cows have no space to turn around in their pens, spend their lives hundreds lined up in rows under a single roof, and are fed so many chemicals, that consumers should be terrified to eat what is found in the grocers freezer.**

Because of our greed for the 'final product,' farming has become one of the most degrading and inhumane acts we could do to our fellow creatures.

With the several proposals of moose farming that have come up, the prospect of the money that would come back to Alaskan residents is very encouraging. However, the source for the money would come at a high cost-another living beings life.

I don't see farming animals at a mass rate and honorable way for a state to make money and create jobs for it's residents.

The thought of domesticating a creature as free and beautiful as a moose should not have even been thought of.

I can see the compassion in taking orphaned moose into a monitored area, but not for slaughter in it's later life! Helping them to survive on their own is a duty we should more than willingly do for them since it was our fault that it's mother is dead.

The only reason these moose should be kept in our reach is to give them the stability that they need to make it on their own when they are old enough. Meaning: We take them in as a calf because their mother's have been killed by one of our cars, or our trains, then raise them until they are competent enough to survive on their own.

I strongly urge you to hold compassion for the moose's rights and do not support this legislative act.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tanya I. Marsh". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Tanya I. Marsh

*4/23/90  
S (K.L./OS)  
copy to  
McKen*

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Agency Affected: Public Safety  
Title: "An Act authorizing moose farming." BRU: Fish & Wildlife Protection  
Sponsor: Senator Coghill Component: Enforcement  
Requestor: Senate Finance

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars) (Inflation not included)

OPERATING	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0	0	0	0	0	0

CAPITAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

REVENUE	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER/PROG RCPT						
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

*Jm*  
*4/18/90* Prepared by: Captain Conrad G. Seibel  
Division: Fish & Wildlife Protection

Phone: 269-5509  
Date: 4-18-90

Approved by Commissioner: Arthur English  
Agency: Department of Public Safety

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 1 of 1

## FISCAL NOTE

**REQUEST:**

Revision Date: 2/12/90  
Title : An Act Authorizing Moose Farming  
Sponsor : Coahill  
Requestor : Coahill

Agency Affected : Fish and Game  
BRU : Wildlife Conservation  
Components Wildlife Conservation

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96
PERSONAL SERVICES	53.8	55.5	56.9	58.3	58.3	60.0
TRAVEL	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>66.9</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>70.0</b>
<b>CAPITAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>REVENUE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**FUNDING:** (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	63.8	65.5	66.9	68.3	68.3	70.0
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>66.9</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>70.0</b>

**POSITIONS:**

FULL-TIME	1	1	1	1	1	1
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS :** (Attach a separate page if necessary) No FY 90 impact.

A permanent full-time Wildlife Biologist III will be hired in a statewide position (located in Fairbanks) to coordinate all activities related to game farming. This employee would issue permits, inspect facilities and animals, work with Fish and Wildlife Protection officers on enforcement problems, and assist the Division of Agriculture in establishing a system for meat inspection and testing for diseases.

Prepared by Waune Reelin Phone 456-5156  
Division : Wildlife Conservation Date : April 12, 1990  
Approved by Commissioner : [Signature] Date : 4/12/90  
Agency : \_\_\_\_\_

Distribution (by preparer) :  
Legislative Finance  
Legislative Sponsor  
Requestor  
Office of Management and Budget  
Impacted Agency(ies)



STATE OF ALASKA  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

BILL ANALYSIS

DEPARTMENT Fish and Game	DIVISION Wildlife Conservation	BILL NUMBER SB 472	SPONSOR Coghill
SHORT TITLE OF BILL An Act Authorizing moose farming			
DEPARTMENT POSITION Opposed			
PREPARED BY Wayne Regelin	DATE 04-16-90	COMRADE/SPONSOR'S SIGNATURE <i>Wayne Regelin</i>	DATE 4/17/90

SUMMARY

OTHER AGENCIES AFFECTED BY BILL Fish and Wildlife Protection Agriculture	CONSTITUENT GROUP(S) AFFECTED BY BILL All Citizens of Alaska
ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR BILL	ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION TO BILL

FISCAL IMPACT:  NONE  FISCAL NOTE ATTACHED

BACKGROUND/LEGISLATIVE INTENT

This legislation would amend AS 16.40.010 and 16.40.020 to allow moose to be raised as domestic animals for commercial purpose and allow meat from these animals to be sold. The Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game would be responsible for determining a surplus of moose existed that could be captured and turned over to private ownership.

ANALYSIS OF BILL/PROGRAM EFFECTS

Moose are the most highly sought after big game species by hunters and outdoor enthusiasts for viewing and photography. Over 50,000 hunters pursued moose in 1989, harvesting about 7,500 to 8,000. Drawing permit applications are oversubscribed by more than 25,000 requests. The demand for moose greatly exceeds the available supply. One proponent of the legislation wants the state to provide him with 100 moose from near Talkeetna to begin his operation. Demand for moose in this area is extremely high.

Moose farming will require large acreages. The primary proponent of this legislation plans to lease state agricultural land near Delta for a moose farm. Highly productive state-owned wildlife habitat would be removed from production of wildlife for general public use and enjoyment. Conflicts between moose farms and large predators are certain to occur. (Cont. on page 2)

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR ANALYSIS.

## ANALYSIS OF BILL/PROGRAM EFFECTS

Populations of wolves, black bears, and grizzly bears will be impacted over a large area surrounding any moose farm.

Ensuring the general welfare and humane treatment of moose on farms will become a responsibility of the department. Moose are not a herd animal and crowding 100 plus moose onto small areas will cause behavior and disease problems. Diseases could be spread to wildlife and domestic animals outside the farm.

Some individuals will use this legislation to own a few moose as a hobby or to promote their tourist business. Allowing wildlife to be exploited by road-side attractions diminishes the value of all wildlife and could lead to legal liability for the state if animals are abused or someone is injured by a moose.

Allowing sale of moose meat will create serious law enforcement problems. Poachers will have an added economic incentive that is currently lacking. The current level of wildlife law enforcement is inadequate to cope with such a new burden.

Moose are expensive to maintain in captivity. The high stocking levels planned for moose farms will require a high level of supplemental feeding. Moose require a special diet, they cannot survive on diets which sustain domestic livestock. Moose farming has proven to be uneconomical in Canada where game farms are common. The Yukon territory prohibited the use of moose and game farms. Moose are not raised commercially in Alberta because they are not profitable. To expect moose farming to succeed in Alaska where no infrastructure exists and no market has been established is not realistic. The state has promoted agriculture projects in the past that resulted in continuing subsidies. We consider providing 100 publicly owned moose to private ownership a subsidy.

Alaska's wildlife resources contribute hundreds of millions of dollars annually through tourism, guiding, hunting, and subsistence. Tourists list viewing wildlife as their primary reason for visiting Alaska. This experience will be diminished in value if tourists observe moose at road-side attractions and game farms.

Public ownership of wildlife and prohibiting sale of game meat are the foundation of wildlife management in North America. We strongly believe that passage of HB 516 (SB 472) would be a major error and would be detrimental to successful wildlife management in Alaska.

(Please see the department briefing paper on moose farming for additional information.)