

RC113

Rebuttal to Proposal # 90 Comments

Submitted by

Michael Pendergrast
P.O. Box 873406
Wasilla, Alaska 99687

e-mail

aklynx@hotmail.com

Thank you for including these comments in the BOG packets on Proposal # 90

March 21, 2016

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

RE: Proposal # 90

Dear Chairman Spraker,

First of all, I want to thank the Board and the Advisory Councils for all the time devoted to our State's wildlife.

I have listened to the public comments for the last several day regarding this proposal. I realize that a potential problem exists and that there are several ways to address this. Proposal # 90 is pretty drastic as a solution. We are all concerned with the welfare of our wild "game" animals and are ready to work together to achieve fair and workable solutions to minimize and reduce potential risks.

Rather than the drastic step of removing of domestic sheep and goats from the "clean list", I suggest that the Board create a working group, similar to the Dall Sheep Working Group, tasked with reaching solutions to present to the Board of Game for approval. By creating a working group, the Board and the Advisory Councils would have direct involvement in the discussions and solutions. A working group, with equal representation from the Board of Game, the Offices of the State Veterinarian, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Law, the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Public Safety, the Farm Bureau, the Dall Sheep Working Group, the Wild Sheep Federation, and domestic livestock owners, would have an official standing and be able to use Board resources to achieve a solution.

Removing the domestic sheep and goats from the "clean list" would cause a huge economic impact on the owners of these animals. These animals are raised to provide food and fiber not only to the owners, but also to the many people that want and/or depend on local availability of these products. In some cases, health issues require a fresh and local supply. Comments to the Board suggested that there are 1000 to 1500 goats raised on private property that could be affected by this proposal. The purchase of top genetic replacement animals (at weening age and under 60 pounds) can easily exceed \$1,000 when transportation, health certificates and kennels are included.

Putting some simple numbers to economic impact / loss

GOAT

meat stock	<u>350 @ \$350 – 1200+</u>	\$ 122,500 – \$ 420,000
fiber goat	250 @ \$250 – 1200+	\$ 62,500 – \$ 300,000
dairy stock	900 @ \$600 – 1200+	\$ 540,000 – \$ 1,080,000
annual expenses	1350 @ \$ 500 – \$1,200	\$ 675,000 – \$ 1,620,000

SHEEP

meat and fiber stock	1500 – 3000 @ \$350 – 1500+	\$ 525,000 – \$ 4,500,000
annual expenses	1500 – 3000 @ \$ 500 – 1200+	\$ 750,000 – \$ 3,600,000

These figures are best guess estimates, and do not include the moneys saved by raising ones own products that would be create an increase in the household food budget.

I urge the Board to take no action on Proposal # 90 and create a Working Group to address the issues and return to the Board a list of suggested proposals/ solutions .

Thank you again for your considerations.

Mike Pendergrast
P.O. Box 873406
Wasilla, Alaska 99687

