

Submitted By  
Adrienne voss  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 5:05:58 PM  
Affiliation



PC235  
1 of 1

I support trap setbacks on mat-su trails! It seems reasonable, & common sense. It still allows for plenty of space for trappers to use, yet provides some safety for humans & pets.



Submitted By  
Jamie Allison  
Submitted On  
2/15/2022 9:17:33 PM  
Affiliation  
  
Phone  
9072321484  
Email  
[aknursing@gmail.com](mailto:aknursing@gmail.com)  
Address  
PO Box 1473  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

I am writing in full support of a 50 yard trap setback for all trails that are in a core population area. A few years ago, I almost stepped into a trap that had been placed on Reflection Lake in the Mat-Su, a popular year-round recreational area. I came across the corpse of a mature female moose that was rotting in a trap on the Matanuska River floodplain near where fat tire bikers and hikers regularly pass by. There is a deplorable lack of enforcement or accountability for trappers who practice unethically, do not reclaim their traps out of season, trap other wildlife incidentally, or place traps in blatantly hazardous locations. There has been shockingly little done on the part of the State of Alaska, Board of Game to reduce the risk of harm to certain types of trail users on multi-use trails as a result of traps. You cannot in good faith designate a trail as a 'multi-use trail' if one user is at risk of injury from using the trail as a direct result of activities permitted to another trail user. The effort of relying on a 'code of ethics' to guide trappers to a more consistent and safe use of traps has not been effective. I am grateful to the Alaska Wildlife Alliance for stepping up when the Board of Game would not to begin gathering data about incidental trap encounters with their Map The Trap initiative. Currently, I consider all lands where trapping is permitted off limits to me and my family during trapping season because the adventure is not worth the risk of harm. I cannot expect that trap placements will be a safe distance from trail users. How is that multi-use?

Submitted By  
Alyssa Wu  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 7:52:36 AM  
Affiliation



PC237  
1 of 1

I support the 50 yard trap setback in multi-use trail areas. These traps are truly a safety concern for those who can only recreate in more convenient and accessible areas.



Submitted By  
Anne L Ver Hoef  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:56:08 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073454422

Email  
[annev@gci.net](mailto:annev@gci.net)

Address  
5820 Yukon Road  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507-6663

I respectfully request that NO traps, snares or other means of capturing wild animals be allowed within a half (1/2) to a quarter (1/4) mile of a trailhead or public use trail. A sign indicating traps have been set should also be posted on the nearest point to a public use trail by the trapper. The trappers should be able to set a trap at least a quarter or a mile away from the main public use trails and trailheads.



Submitted By

Becci

Submitted On

2/17/2022 7:37:26 PM

Affiliation

Public

Yes please pass 50 yard setback from public use trails in natMat-Su Borough



Submitted By  
Melissa Bell  
Submitted On  
1/16/2022 4:04:48 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9078303031  
Email  
[Melissal Hulme@yahoo.com](mailto:Melissal Hulme@yahoo.com)  
Address  
2431 Nancy circle  
Anchorage , Alaska 99516

Good Evening,

Traps do not belong anywhere near parks, schools, parking lots, or any public multi use trails and it is unacceptable that that is still allowed. A change here is long overdue to the policy. Even a 500 foot setback is not far enough. Thank you for considering the safety of our children, outdoor enthusiast and pets.

Submitted By  
Beth Spence  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 10:31:25 AM  
Affiliation



PC241  
1 of 1

I agree that traps should be moved farther off trails. I'm sad to that peoples dogs have been injured.

Submitted By  
Bethan Carter  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 4:02:03 PM  
Affiliation



PC242  
1 of 1

To whom it is concerned,

Please consider adopting the proposed 50-yard trap setbacks on popular multi-use trails including those in the following areas: Nancy Lakes, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and others. It is currently legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May.

Adopting this setback will increase the safety of humans and their pets. Already, at least seven dogs have been caught in traps, and two of them have been killed in Southcentral Alaska just this winter.

I recreate in the Mat-su area, and I want to feel safe doing so with my family--human or otherwise. Safe recreation brings money and greater health to the Mat-su area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bethan Carter





Submitted By  
Traci Bradford  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:00:34 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-982-8320

Email  
[tracibradford67@gmail.com](mailto:tracibradford67@gmail.com)

Address  
7261 S Hayfield Rd  
Wasilla, Alaska 99623

I am in favor of the setback, especially for trails located in more populated areas and neighborhoods. Examples being Settlers Bay Coastal Park, Scout Ridge, and Govt Peak. I have personal experience with these trails and happily support them with donations and park passes. These trails are more heavily trafficked by families and individuals for winter hiking, biking, and skiing; and I don't think families are on the lookout for traps or even realize they can legally be literally right outside their own back yards. However, when I use trails in more rural areas, I realize I am taking a risk and try to be cautious. I am in favor of the 50 yard setback; I think that is a fair compromise for all to enjoy our wonderful multi-use trail system.

Submitted By  
Bradley A Rud  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 9:02:16 AM  
Affiliation



PC244  
1 of 1

A distinction needs to be made between leghold traps and snares placed on the ground and martin traps placed in trees. No dog is in any danger from martin traps, but a 50 yard setback can effectively put a trapper out of business. Also, I would recommend 25 yards, not 50. Even this will substantially decrease a trapper's ability to run a decent line.



Submitted By  
Bryan Silva  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:11:40 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9077440065  
Email  
[brsilvaak@gmail.com](mailto:brsilvaak@gmail.com)

Address  
4621 Piper St. #16  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

The outdoors are a multiuse resource and do not belong to whoever takes the most exclusive use. Trapping is offensive to many and is considered a form of "recreation" to some of its practitioners. It should not be allowed in areas where it will lead to conflict and a bad image for the state. If it is to be allowed, the beneficiaries should be burdened with making it fit in to other uses. This means that commonly used trails and areas of other recreational uses must be avoided.

Bullying by the trappers of the general public must not be allowed. By purposely placing traps where they threaten other users this is the result. This is like placing mines in those areas. The owners of dogs killed or injured by traps would agree that this is unreasonable. The owners of pets might avoid areas with traps just as they would avoid areas with explosive mines. The absence of recreational outdoor users does not justify trapping if they are absent out of fear.

Keep trapping to areas remote from recreational users.

Submitted By  
Burt spence  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 8:51:13 AM  
Affiliation



PC246  
1 of 1

I have no issues with trapping in general but would like to see increased set back parameters in place around well used public access points and trails. We run hunting dogs off leash in similar areas and I typically decrease my use of known trapping areas during the overlapping hunting/trapping season. This limits my access to possible hunting areas due to concern of safety for my hunting dogs.



Submitted By  
Marti Buscaglia  
Submitted On  
1/17/2022 2:21:02 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-268-9391

Email  
[marbusfri214@gmail.com](mailto:marbusfri214@gmail.com)

Address  
22605 Deer Park Dr  
Chugiak, Alaska 99567

Please vote to create trapping setbacks on trails. It will not highly inconvenience trappers and will make the Mat-Su area a safe place to recreate with our dogs. Ethical trappers already follow the guidelines, but we know from recent accidents with dogs that not all trappers are following them. Making it a requirement is sure to give inexperienced or new trappers the information they need to trap safely and responsibly. Thank you for your consideration.



Submitted By  
Raymond Cammisa  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 12:15:05 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9077267977

Email  
[Raybird68@hotmail.com](mailto:Raybird68@hotmail.com)

Address  
17615 Lacey Dr  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

We are proposing 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more.

opposition to Trapping will grow to wanting and needing a complete ban on urban trapping. 50 yards or set backs are nothing and even the laziest of people can go 50 yards off the trails.  
thank you



Submitted By  
Carlene Van Tol  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:19:34 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9077485270  
Email  
[aktuffer@gmail.com](mailto:aktuffer@gmail.com)

Address  
P.O. Box 169  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

I have lived in Alaska for twenty years and have seen tremendous growth in the Mat-Su borough during that time. I love the traditional ways of The Last Frontier, and I have two fur hats; however, I believe it is safest to keep traps set back away from trails for the safety of all who enjoy them. I support the proposal for the 50-yard setback on trails in Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hat Flats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacierview, Matanuska Susitna Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Willow, Nelchina, and more. I believe ethical trappers will find no objection to this proposal.

Submitted By  
Carole Holley  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 8:33:40 AM  
Affiliation



PC250  
1 of 1

Thank you for taking into consideration the safety of pets and other trail users. In order to protect pets, children, and inexperienced (or distracted) trail users, I would ask that you strongly consider including a provision that requires traps are setback a 1/4 mile from a trail along with a sign at the trail warning that "Trapping is 1/4 mile from trails." Thank you for your consideration.



Submitted By  
Cassie Kinsland  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 12:41:01 PM  
Affiliation



PC251  
1 of 1

I believe a 50 yard setback minimum is reasonable and should be implemented. Though, based on the average distance a typical person travels off the trail, I would prefer the setback to be at least one mile. A variety of community members use these trails and very frequently it is on these trails where people can, and do, go lost or missing. As a Search and Rescue K9 handler, my dog is trained to search for people and can cover a vast amount of acres in a short amount of time when searching off leash: this saves valuable time when your loved one is missing and/or injured and needs immediate help. However, we provide this community service, free of charge, at the dog's peril due to trapping. We endanger our K9 partner's life every single time we step onto these trails to render aid to our community. Please consider all community members, including your working K9s, when making this decision. A 50 yard setback for traps that kill is not too much to ask. Thank you.

Submitted By  
Cecelia Quinn  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 11:03:34 AM  
Affiliation



PC252  
1 of 1

I would like to encourage you to approve a greater setback for traps off of easements and hiking trails. Making it 50 yards would be a start, but frankly, dogs will get into trouble even with this, as their excellent noses will smell bait from a long way off. It seems like most trappers use snowmachines or dog sleds, and I would advocate for them being off trails entirely, in places where people and dogs don't get anywhere close to. This does not seem like a huge hardship for snowmachiners and mushers, as they often are off trail systems as a matter of course. If you've ever heard a dog screaming in a trap, you will never forget the horror. And while we're on the subject of trapping, I would also advocate for checking traps VERY frequently. We know a trapper who told us he checks them once a week, which is incredibly cruel if an animal of any kind has to sit in a trap for that long. Sometimes they chew their own leg off while waiting. My husband has to register and tag any personal use crab pots, while a trapper has no obligation to identify or mark trap sites, or be responsible for any legal issues for trap location. Thank you for your consideration on this issue. Within the last year we know of at least 4 dogs caught in traps within a few miles of our house on a quiet road, and 3 others several miles away.

Sincerely,

Cecelia Quinn



Submitted By  
Chris Wilson  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 8:16:34 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072505622

Email  
[Wilaska907@gmail.com](mailto:Wilaska907@gmail.com)

Address  
10914 John Henry  
Palmer , Alaska 99645

Please ban trapping on multiuse trails. If not a full ban than I request that the board considers significant set backs of 500 feet or greater and that traps be marked with a visual signage that can be read from a distance of 200 feet or more



Submitted By  
Colin McGovern  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 9:10:02 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
2073194205

Email  
[colinmcgovern@gmail.com](mailto:colinmcgovern@gmail.com)

Address  
39377 Woodman Ln. N.  
Homer, Alaska 99603

I am in full support of a setback for traps on all trails, not just multi use - I beleive this to be a very reasonable ask of the state and one that would prevent a lot of injury/fatalities in the future to dogs and even children and adults! Please please please consider this... Thank you

Submitted By

Connor Mahon

Submitted On

2/18/2022 1:29:22 PM

Affiliation



PC255

1 of 1

As a lifelong Alaskan citizen I would like to voice my opinion that I do NOT approve of trapping on trails that are used by a multitude of other residents especially when the trails are used by people with children and dogs in tow. I understand the need for trapping by individuals that relay on it for food sustenance but when you live within an hours drive of Carrs or Fred Meyer I don't see how this could be used as an argument.

Submitted By  
Terry Cummings  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:15:20 PM  
Affiliation



PC256  
1 of 1

Regarding Trap Setback:

I encourage you to vote for the Trap Setbacks as too many dogs are being caught in traps and dying or becoming injured and suffering. These are family pets and are part of families. There is no reason for not supporting these setbacks.



Submitted By  
Danelle Jefson  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 8:47:53 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072403976  
Email  
[akdanelle@yahoo.com](mailto:akdanelle@yahoo.com)  
Address  
PO Box 1591  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Thank you for providing a format to comment.

I am an avid trail user in many locations in Southcentral Alaska. The trails are wonderful and a large part of my joy in living in such an amazing place. We have two dogs and regularly have them with us on trails. They are under voice command and off leash when far from a trailhead and it is permitted. The use of traps near trails scares me for the safety of our dogs. Each year, I watch the ADF&G video on how to free a dog from a Conibear trap and carry a flat leash for that purpose. I hope to never need to perform such a freeing. I do realize backcountry and trail access is valued to trappers, and many other trail users.

To limit traps to at least 1/4 mile from a trail corridor is a good compromise. Dogs will be much safer and not as drawn to bait further from the trails. 50 yards is simply too close.

Please pass ordinance to limit traps to at least 1/4 mile from any dogs, children or adults who use established trails.

Thank you. Sincerely, Danelle Jefson



Submitted By  
Danny Rosenkrans  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:31:29 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
19072595582  
Email  
[rosenkransdanny@gmail.com](mailto:rosenkransdanny@gmail.com)  
Address  
POB 432  
Copper Center, Alaska 99573

I strongly recommend adopting this proposal. Trapping is a privilege and should be managed to support the public's right of access within well established travel corridors, designated trails and ANCSA 17b easements.. Trapping is not an appropriate purpose within trails and easements currently utilized. Many trail corridors cross a complex pattern of land status. Trailhead signage should be posted to inform users regarding trapping restrictions. All dog owners should responsibility control their pets as required to by law and avoid impacting private property..



Submitted By  
Debra Stogdill  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 11:55:27 AM  
Affiliation



PC259  
1 of 1

Greetings, this comment is in regards to the issue of trap setting along established recreational trails. A great amount of the pleasure these trails provide is the freedom to include your whole family in the enjoyment of use. Small children and dogs do not always stay within the edges of the trail, and really shouldn't have to. Safety for these younger & less aware must be a priority. Trapping along public use trails just can't be & shouldn't be a concern for those who are blessed to use any of the trails open for public use. There can't even be a true call for it to happen, since animals in general avoid areas common to human use. The standard of a substantial buffer zone between trails and the ability to set traps absolutely needs to exist. We all appreciate & benefit from such a wise ruling. Thank you, Debra Stogdill



Submitted By  
Diane  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:56:22 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
Taylor  
Email  
[Taylor62.2016@gmail.com](mailto:Taylor62.2016@gmail.com)

Address  
P. O. Box 457  
Kasilof, Alaska 99610

I am writing in support of the proposed 50-yard trap setback in the Mat-Su Valley area. As the density in population continues to increase in the valley (an increase of over 20% in 2020!) it becomes imperative that Fish and Game understand and help balance the impact of traditional trapping activities along side leisure and recreational use of Alaska lands. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Submitted By  
Chris Diekman  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:15:50 PM  
Affiliation



PC261  
1 of 1

There is a proposal for 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. Currently, it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May.

This winter alone, at least seven dogs have been caught in traps, and two of them have been killed in Southcentral Alaska. Certainly these protections can be put in place to protect users, children, and their pets from harm along these multi-use trails.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Submitted By  
Dorothy Sturges  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 3:22:19 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
5206034507  
Email  
[chili333@mac.com](mailto:chili333@mac.com)

Address  
POB 282  
Sonoita, Arizona 85637

Trapping is a cruel form of maiming anad/or killing anad must be stopped at once.



Submitted By  
Dr. Shea Long  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 12:00:43 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
2088696432

Email  
[Shea.long8@gmail.com](mailto:Shea.long8@gmail.com)

Address  
2430 tasha dr  
Anchorage , Alaska 99502

I am writing to support creating a "safe zone" around trails by requiring traps to be placed 50 yards from the trails. This is a safety issue not only for pets but for children and adults as well. Please consider this important proposal from the community.



Submitted By  
Drew Hosselton  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:28:51 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-982-1380

Email  
[andrew\\_hosselton@yahoo.com](mailto:andrew_hosselton@yahoo.com)

Address  
675 3rd St  
Palmer , Alaska 99645

Laws surrounding trapping in the Mat-Su valley are out of date. The area and the amount of recreational users has outgrown the current regulations. Given the abundance of land and game in our state, I cannot see a valid reason as to why it is necessary to trap in such high traffic areas as Rabbit Slough, Mat Lakes, etc. The number of people using these areas for recreation far exceeds those who use it to trap, so why do the majority of users need to put the lives of pets and children at risk so a minority can trap game as a hobby? No one is asking to put an end to trapping, but the time has come to update regulations that are safer for the general population instead of a fading minority.



Submitted By  
Emily Garrity  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 9:59:56 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072994717  
Email  
[egarrity907@gmail.com](mailto:egarrity907@gmail.com)  
Address  
39377 WOODMAN LN N  
Homer, Alaska 99603

I am writing to express my full support of a 50 yard trap setback to increase public safety on multi-use trails. We are in Homer and in the last month, four dogs have been trapped close to the Watermelon Trail. Outdoor recreation is a major component of being healthy in Alaska in the winter. We need our public use trail systems to be safe for families and dogs to freely recreate.

Thank you for your consideration,

Emily Garrity





Submitted By  
Eric Vilmer  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 7:17:08 PM  
Affiliation



PC266  
1 of 1

Hi I am requesting 50-yard trap setbacks from multi-use trails in the MatSu region

Submitted By  
Esther Adler  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 8:16:59 PM  
Affiliation



PC267  
1 of 1

I'm an avid outdoorswoman and have my best furry friend with me wherever she's allowed to go. I recently learned of several trails I was hoping to go with her that have traps close to the multiuse trail. This is very concerning for someone that hikes and bikes all over Alaska. I'm hoping you mandate a 50 yard trap set back to protect dogs and their families from getting hurt and killed.



Submitted By  
Fay Ondelacy  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 6:31:29 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-229-9248

Email  
[Fyondelacy@gmail.com](mailto:Fyondelacy@gmail.com)

Address  
3439 Briarcliff Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Dear Alaska Board of Game,

Please help reduce the trapping of our dear pets (dogs). The numerous traps set is far too much and can be reduced greatly without impediment on your part. Just asking to reduce.

Thank you,

Sincerely, Fay Ondelacy



Submitted By

Charles

Submitted On

2/16/2022 2:30:21 PM

Affiliation

Phone

Freedman

Email

[tsunamichuck@yahoo.com](mailto:tsunamichuck@yahoo.com)

Address

4530 South Teton Circle

Wasilla, Alaska 99654

Please pass a 50 yard zone between traps and trails.



Submitted By  
Guadalupe Marroquin  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 2:07:57 PM  
Affiliation  
Anchorage Resident and trail user

Phone  
206-743-1608

Email  
[lovethejourney.lupe@gmail.com](mailto:lovethejourney.lupe@gmail.com)

Address  
6300 Bubbling Brook Circle  
Anchorage, Alaska 99516

My recommendation is trapping be allowed, no closer than/a minimum of 1/4 mile from a trail, with a sign at the trail stating "Trapping 1/4 mile". Additional signage each half mile would also keep the public aware, and avoid needless and grievous harm and death to children and dogs.



Submitted By  
Guinevere Hill  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 5:09:15 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073154610

Email  
[Guin.Hill@matsuk12.us](mailto:Guin.Hill@matsuk12.us)

Address  
2424 north willow dr  
Wasilla, Alaska 99654

Alaskan laws should clearly state trappers must set their traps very far from trail systems. Children and dog safety should come first. Any true Alaskan trapper can make the extra effort to trap so everyone stays safe.



Submitted By  
Hannah Kroon  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 10:25:14 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907 830 7713  
Email  
[hkroon90@gmail.com](mailto:hkroon90@gmail.com)

Address  
2970 E Tamarak Ave  
Wasilla, Alaska 99654

I support the trapping setbacks to be at least 50 yards from multi-use trails. I live in the Matsu Valley and use many multi use trail systems here. The Matsu Valley population has grown tremendously since the trapping regulations were first established, and they no longer take into account the amount of traffic the trails see for recreational activities.

Submitted By  
Heather Dean  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:32:52 AM  
Affiliation



PC273  
1 of 1

Regulations around trapping distances from multi-use trails

ADFG,

As an avid trail user with children and a dog, I strongly support a greater, standard, trapping distance away from all of the trails. While I believe everyone has a right to use the trails, in cases such as trapping that use fresh meat as bait and could result in painful lose of life to trail users companions, a trapping distance of one quarter mile from the trail is not an unreasonable compromise. That's only one walk around a high school football field. This is a distance that will deminish the smell of fresh meat from the trail, and is a very easy distance for a trapper who uses trails to walk with his/her gear.  
Thank you for your time.



Submitted By  
Heather Guthrie  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 5:49:11 PM  
Affiliation



PC274  
1 of 1

I am commenting to support the proposal of distancing traps from trails in the MatSu and surrounding areas. It is important to respect the rights of others to recreate and the usage of traps in close proximity to heavily trafficked trails and areas inhibits such peaceful co-recreation. It is not as simple as "keep your dog on a leash" or "keep your eyes on your children at all times" as anyone who has ever recreated with either the canine or the young knows that things happen. And they tend to happen quickly. I am a mother of a toddler and a senior, deaf dog who continually keep me on my toes in the backcountry. Mixing in any other variable (moose or bear or alarming sounds) means that one or both are susceptible to bolting. It is entirely possible to remain vigilant 100% of the time, but for those of us with more human tendencies, it is likely that at one time or another we have lost control of our less-trail-strict comrades. At these times, the rights of a trapper to trap infringe upon the right of a mother to recreate with her wanderlust companions. It is my opinion that traps should be placed at a minimum of 1/4 mile from each trail or trafficked area. At the very least I support the proposed extension to 50-yard trap setbacks. It is the least we can do to protect our vulnerable and our beloved.

Submitted By  
Josh Hejl  
Submitted On  
1/9/2022 7:27:42 AM  
Affiliation



PC275  
1 of 1

I am writing to support the trapping setback for all trails.

I am tired of city/leisure trappers running amok on our public land.

Some basic common sense rules need to be applied because unfortunately they are unwilling to be responsible.

thank you.

Submitted By  
Holly Norwood  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 6:32:25 PM  
Affiliation



PC276  
1 of 1

Clifford and Holly Norwood have a cabin in the Crossman Ridge area of Homer. The dogs of our neighbors have been captured in traps placed too near to trails and roads. It is only a matter of time before children are caught.

We are not against trapping in principal.

What we do not support is having traps so close to passageways and roads. The simple solution is to disallow the setting of traps in proximity of any passageway that residents or hikers or anybody may explore. Those who traip claim an interest in the great outdoors. They just need to go farther to make this activity safe for all.

Submitted By  
Hope McGratty  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 6:12:32 AM  
Affiliation



PC277  
1 of 1

To Whom It May Concern:

I support 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails. My husband and I utilize the trail system in South Central Alaska year around for hiking, running, skiing, and biking. Our 5 year old dog is always with us. In the last two months we have had two sets of friends have dogs caught in traps (Knik area and Kenai area). One dog was freed and one did not make it. This is terrifying. Safety for everyone can be improved while still allowing safe trapping. Please support a 50-yard trap setback.

Respectfully,

Hope McGratty



Submitted By  
Kristine E Hutchin  
Submitted On  
1/21/2022 1:49:39 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9076967250

Email  
[khutchin@mtaonline.net](mailto:khutchin@mtaonline.net)

Address  
10335 Stewart Dr  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

In my opinion, there should be a setback for traps on trails used by the public. That seems reasonable to me. Right now we are very fortunate that no children/toddlers have been caught in traps. Trappers will say the parents should be responsible to prevent children from being "trapped", but young children are SO fast that they are gone in a blink of an eye without parents even noticing, even while they are watching their children that the kids have gone off trail. So are parents supposed to leash their kids? I think not. The setback is not an unreasonable request of the trapping community. In addition with people using trails, do trappers really think the animals they want to trap are going to stay in areas of the trails? Only if the animal is rabid will they be near a trail. ADFG should be aware that any child or person who is "trapped" near a trail, the State of Alaska will most likely sued.



Submitted By  
Jacob Gabriel Richards  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 2:33:27 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
5205374547

Email  
[jr6115007@gmail.com](mailto:jr6115007@gmail.com)

Address  
4900 East 5th Street Apt.1210  
1210  
Tuscon, Arizona 85711

Please think of public safety and keep traps away from roads and camp grounds buy at least 100 feet if not more. Or ban them during tourist travels and visiting hours so staff and public and hunters themselves won't be hurt. Thank you.



Submitted By  
Jake Hansen  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:32:33 PM  
Affiliation  
  
Phone  
2089930456  
Email  
[40Hansen@gmail.com](mailto:40Hansen@gmail.com)  
Address  
PO Box 3165  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

As a Palmer resident who regularly used the local trails with my dog, I support a 50 yard set back of traps. Public lands are to be used and shared by everyone, but if traps are set so closely to trails, it negatively affects non-trappers abilities to recreate freely. It is ethical and should be mandatory to keep users and their animals safe from traps by keeping them away from frequently shared trails.



Submitted By  
Jane Baldwin  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 4:57:11 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9077209394  
Email  
[jane.baldwin@alaska.gov](mailto:jane.baldwin@alaska.gov)  
Address  
PO Box 670981  
Chugiak, Alaska 99567

Over the past few years two of my dogs have been caught in baited traps, both set very near a frequently used trail. One trail was out of Knik, the other was on Ptarmagin Trail in Peter's Creek. Both times I was able to get my dog out without permanent injury, thankfully.

Once dog owners know there are baited traps on the trails, especially right next to the trail, that means that now that person can't really use the trail anymore. Honestly, is a dog owner going to keep their dog on a leash 2 miles up a steep trail? No. So in that case, 1 trapper is now able to use the trail, but 50 hikers are not able to. Trapping sacrifices the rights of the many for the few.

Thank you,

Jane D. Baldwin  
(907) 720-9394





Submitted By  
Janet Rhodes  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 10:20:34 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
7606995750  
Email  
[janetrhodes1@msn.com](mailto:janetrhodes1@msn.com)

Address  
31240 Calle Cirros  
Temecula , California 92592

Please accept the proposed 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. Currently, it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May.

This winter alone, at least seven dogs have been caught in traps, and two of them have been killed in Southcentral Alaska.

Thanks for your attention to this.



Submitted By  
Jessica Shepherd  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 10:44:18 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072998811

Email  
[shepherdinthegarden@icloud.com](mailto:shepherdinthegarden@icloud.com)

Address  
PO Box 15332  
Fritz Creek, Alaska 99603-6332

As a dog owner, I experienced the trauma of having a dog caught in a trapline near my home. After weeks of expensive vet visits and at-home care, she lost three toes and we retired her (at age three) from skijouring. I am not opposed to trapping per se, but a 50-yard setback doesn't seem like too much to ask for multi-use trails. Please support this change.

Thank you,

Jessica Shepherd



Submitted By  
Jessica Thornton  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 4:45:29 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9079525753

Email  
[jessicathorntondesigns@gmail.com](mailto:jessicathorntondesigns@gmail.com)

Address  
675 3rd Street  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

As a dog owner and frequent trail user, I fully support updates to trapping regulations. We need larger setbacks on popular trails to protect all users. Our current regulations are outdated and have not kept up with the increase in population and increase of users on our trails. Pet owners and parents should not have to fear for the safety of their children and animals while out enjoying our trails - it is not unreasonable to ask for setbacks to help prevent user conflicts from arising. Ethical trappers should be staying away from populated trails to begin with, so this shouldn't be a heavy burden when compared to the danger that traps pose to the rest of the public and our pets. Please approve these updates.



Submitted By

Jill K Valerius

Submitted On

2/16/2022 4:30:11 PM

Affiliation

I am in support of a 50 yard trap setback on trails in the Mat-Su.

Thank you,

Jill Valerius

Submitted By  
Joanne Singleton  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 3:27:34 PM  
Affiliation



PC286  
1 of 1

I love the opportunity to run, ski and hike with my dog. She is 17 months old and is on voice command and we use an e-collar in case we experience wildlife along the way. Our time outside is much more enjoyable because she can have some freedom bring off a physical leash. She never goes more than 6 to 10 feet off trail. I want to keep her close but now I'm terrified that even that is too far because an unidentified trap can be hidden by the side of the multi use trail. I also have a niece and a nephew and they too like to explore the woods. Given the size of Alaska and the fact so few people trap, I see no reason why limits can't be set to stop trapping near popular and well used areas. I feel very strongly that given there are way more dogs owners using these trails than there are trappers it is time for the trappers to compromise and move to less populated areas.



Submitted By  
Sharon B Johnson  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 11:35:10 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073154376

Email  
[mans4@gci.net](mailto:mans4@gci.net)

Address  
2760 N Barrys Resort Dr  
Wasilla , Alaska 99654

Please set the trap setbacks to 50 yards. It is the right thing to do with the grieing number of people getting out of the trails. Thank you for your considetation.

Submitted By

Josh

Submitted On

2/16/2022 7:45:48 PM

Affiliation



PC288

1 of 1

Hi, my name is Josh and I'm a frequent user of the trails in the valley. I've personally had to help get a dog out of a trap that was located at an unexceptable distance to a public trail and it wasn't fun. These are the same trails I take my kids out on to explore nature and these traps scare the hell out of me. It would be nice if we could have a standardized set back distance so that we all can enjoy our public spaces safely. Thank you for your time.



Submitted By  
Judith Steyer  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 8:36:48 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
5415146341  
Email  
[Steyerbill@yahoo.com](mailto:Steyerbill@yahoo.com)  
Address  
P.O. Box 15036  
Homer, Alaska 99603

I support legislation to restrict the proximity of animal traps placement at least 50 yards from public use trails.

As a pet owner and previous sled dog owner I have had several nearly fatal experiences of dogs getting caught in animal traps while out recreating on public multiuse trails. This law could help prevent many future situations that would endanger animals.

Thank you for your consideration

Judith Steyer





Submitted By  
Louise Kane  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:13:04 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
5082378326

Email  
[louise@kaneproductions.net](mailto:louise@kaneproductions.net)

Address  
920 Herringbrook Road  
Eastham, Massachusetts 02642

My family has long held residence in Anchorage. One the things I dislike about Alaska is its horridly archaic attitude about trapping, snaring and killing predators. Not only do I support a setback but I would like to see this barbaric activity ended. How many of us would support this appalling activity if we saw just one animal languishing in a trap. Many civilised countries have banned trapping, its about time we did too.

Louise Kane, JD

Submitted By  
Karen Shoemaker  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 2:10:07 PM  
Affiliation



PC291  
1 of 1

Please keep trapping away from our trails which so many of use with our pets....i vote for the 50 yard boundry at a minimum!!!

Thank you

Karen Shoemaker and family



Submitted By  
Kari  
Submitted On  
1/19/2022 5:17:36 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9076883272  
Email  
[Krunnerkb@gmail.com](mailto:Krunnerkb@gmail.com)  
Address  
24217 Platsek Dr  
Chigiak, Alaska 99567

I would like to see more restrictions on trapping near popular trailheads and trails. People, families, kids and dogs should have safe means of exploring the backcountry and trails without unfair enticement of bait and traps near popular trailheads. There are thousands of Alaska acres of hunting property. Maintained trails and trailheads should remain safe of traps for people, kids and dogs who meander off-trail and in the vicinity of hiking trails. Baiting traps is both dangerous and an unfair advantage against curious kids and domesticated animals including dogs.

Submitted By  
Karrin Parker  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:00:24 PM  
Affiliation



PC293  
1 of 1

Phone  
907-570-7688  
Email  
[parkerkarrin@gmail.com](mailto:parkerkarrin@gmail.com)  
Address  
PO 3667  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

I am writing to support the proposal for :

50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Krik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. I am a dog owner and spend a lot of time out doors with my dogs on all of these trails. Alaska is a huge state and there are many areas that can be utilized for trapping that would be less of a threat to family pets and people , I believe that trapping should be done well away from heavily used areas where pets, and people can get injured or killed.



Submitted By  
Kathryn Tryck  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 1:45:42 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072425169

Email  
[ktryck@gmail.com](mailto:ktryck@gmail.com)

Address  
5125 Whispering Spruce Drive  
Anchorage , Alaska 99516

I am in favor of the 50 yard set back for traps. It is the absolute minimum acceptable for safety. I think it should be more. My family has had property in the Matsu Valley for over 100 years. We spend many weeks there year round hiking, boating, swimming, skiing etc. For the safety of children (and adults) and pets not staying strictly on trails, just wandering the danger of traps is very real, especially in the winter cross country skiing! The areas under consideration are recreation areas heavily used year round.

YES!! Vote in favor of making the 50 yard set back for traps a reality! For the safety of all who recreate outside in the Valley!

Kathryn Tryck

Submitted By  
Kelby Morisse  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:52:30 PM  
Affiliation



PC295  
1 of 1

Hello,

I was skiing at Nancy Lake Cabin and was staying at a public use cabin. I was skiing with my dogs on the most popular trail leading off the lake in the southeastern corner of the lake. A snare was set less than 10 feet off the trail and approximately 50 yards from the lake itself. I'm an avid small game hunter and this trap placement was/is very unethical. I could reach the trap with my ski pole while I was still on the trail.



Submitted By  
Ken Green  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 10:28:16 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
+19075951643  
Email  
[kennkay@arctic.net](mailto:kennkay@arctic.net)

Address  
Pobox 776  
Cooper Landing, Alaska 99572

Support set back regulations for trappers in multi-use areas in Alaska. Thank you.

Submitted By  
Kim Kittredge  
Submitted On  
1/8/2022 9:33:43 PM  
Affiliation



PC297  
1 of 1

I believe minimum setbacks and 'Active trapline' signage are simple solutions to minimize conflicts along multiuse trails.



Submitted By  
Kristin O'Connor  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:06:38 AM  
Affiliation



PC298  
1 of 1

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been made aware of Proposal 199 Ammended. I support it, but would like to offer some insight into the useage of Swan Lake "Quggesh" Boardwald and Loop Trail located in Wasilla. This trail should be included in the proposal. The description of the trail from the Greatland Trust's website states "A trail to the north takes you on a 1-mile upland loop through a beautiful birch forest, with more views from the bluff out into the Refuge. The area is also the location of a former Dena'ina village site and holds cultural significance. The area is called *Quggesh*, which means swan." This trail is also located in a new subdivision and gets a lot of use from families in the neighborhood.

I am a teacher at Machetanz Elementary School. My class, and many others, use this trail on a weekly basis to extend our learning to the outdoors. Outdoor studies are an integral part of our school philosophy. We waited 7 years to get this trail built so that we could have access to a nature trail. The kids look forward to our weekly outings. They make observations, learn about the unique flora and fauna of our area, conduct nature studies, and enjoy just being in nature. There are borough supported archeological digs going on just off the main trails as well, and many more that have been identified but not excavated.

Please put the Swan Lake "Quggesh" trail on the list as part of this proposal.

Thank you,

Kristin O'Connor

K/1 Teacher

Machetanz Elementary School

Submitted By  
Kristine Hutchin  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 4:28:27 PM  
Affiliation



PC299  
1 of 1

Traps near frequently used public trails have been responsible for trapping dogs in which some died and others maimed. Regulations are needed so traps are placed 50 yards from public trails. I don't know Why traps are set do close to public trails because just the fact of people using the trails will scare animals away from any trap so no animals will be trapped. The first time a toddler, child, or any person is caught in a trap near a public trail, it can be guaranteed that there will be a lawsuit against the State of Alaska.

Submitted By

Krysta

Submitted On

2/17/2022 9:36:43 AM

Affiliation



PC300  
1 of 1

I am writing in support of the 50-yard setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails. When there are traps set on or near trails without warning, it makes it very difficult for people to keep themselves, their children and their pets safe. I wouldn't want a family member of mine stepping on something like that, and you shouldn't either. Thank you for your time.



Submitted By  
Andrea K Lang  
Submitted On  
1/8/2022 6:55:32 PM  
Affiliation  
Andrea Lang

Phone  
9072449290

Email  
[andrealang827@gmail.com](mailto:andrealang827@gmail.com)

Address  
1351 Early View Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Though I believe a 50 yard trail buffer for trapping is insufficient, I think it's important to stipulate a distance in order to keep pets and people safe. I am an avid hiker and skier, and although I am an Anchorage resident, I do recreate in the Matsu. I have dogs who run off leash in the backcountry and I fear for their safety regarding trapping along trails. Additionally, these traps are often baited and dogs will be lured to these traps.

Trails accomodate various user groups, however no particular group has the right to create an unsafe situation for others. Trapping so close to a trail used by children and pets create possibility for injury and death. Please consider the 50 yard set back.

Submitted By  
Laura Eide  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:23:57 PM  
Affiliation



PC302  
1 of 1

Please consider creating a trapping setback near popular trails. Traps set near trail heads and just off the trail are a danger to dogs and create anxiety amongst users of the trail. Moreover, every time a dog is caught in a trap, it contributes to significant anti-trapper sentiment. The more times that people hear about dogs being caught or killed in a trap, the greater likelihood that people will advocate for banning trapping altogether. In order for trappers and other trail users to go coexist peacefully, it is important for the interaction between them to be minimal. One common sense action that can be done to achieve this is to create distance between traps and other trail users by requiring a setback.

Submitted By  
Laurie Hueffer  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:37:49 AM  
Affiliation



PC303  
1 of 1

I am writing in support of common sense trapping safety measures to include clear marking, contact information and 50 yard setbacks from popular multi-use trails in all areas of Alaska. Alaskans and tourists alike access these trails through-out the state and deserve safe access.

Luckily, 'only' dogs have been injured and killed thus far. While this is horrendous, what would be more so is the injury of any child or adult simply out recreating due to laziness and lack of accountability of the minor portion of trappers who don't follow basic safety guidelines and give all a bad name.

Trapping has a place in Alaska, however it should not be allowed without regulation to include clear marking, contact information and 50 yard setbacks on popular multi-use trails.

I also feel correct restraint of animals should be clearly marked and enforced on these multi-use trails.

This is not a one-sided issue. All users deserve safety, consideration and access to enjoyment of the outdoors. Regulation is simply necessary to ensure safe and enjoyable access functions for all.

Thank you for your time,

Laurie Hueffer

Submitted By  
Liane Crosta  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 1:01:54 PM  
Affiliation



PC304  
1 of 1

I absolutely disagree with traps being set next to trails made for families and pets. Pets are being caught, and this is inhumane!

Submitted By  
Lindsay Branholm  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 12:16:22 PM  
Affiliation



PC305  
1 of 1

I feel strongly about implementing this change. The Matsu borough has grown tremendously which means way more people out exploring our land and trails. We should be able to go out with our family pets and not have to worry about losing them to such negligence.



Submitted By  
Lindsay Cronin  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 9:15:28 AM  
Affiliation



PC306  
1 of 1

I fully support the proposed 50-yard trap setbacks on popular multi-use trails. I'm honestly astounded such a rule doesn't exist and that trappers are simply "asked" to do the right thing. We don't "ask" people to obey the speed limit or leave the property of others alone; we legally enforce it through laws and regulations. I do not understand why trappers get a pass on being held accountable for their actions.

I cannot think of any other circumstances where someone is not only free from legal repercussions when essentially booby-trapping public land but in fact legally protected in doing so. Why do they have a right to make any public space unsafe for me and potentially deadly for my dogs?

Putting aside the leash debate, one of my dogs is training in search and rescue. She cannot be trained and leashed at the same time. Her skillset requires her to run freely and find people. How am I supposed to keep her safe, in training, and, most importantly, alive when baited traps could be anywhere and everywhere for months at a time?

There are enough dangers present when enjoying the beautiful natural settings of Alaska in winter. Angry moose, thin ice, avalanches. Humans haphazardly and randomly setting lethal killing machines wherever they please should not be one of them.

The time has come to recognize the right to safety of all the non-trappers who recreate on our trails and provide them legally enforceable protections against careless trappers.

Submitted By  
Lindsay Hixon  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 8:04:33 AM  
Affiliation



PC307  
1 of 1

Hello, this comment is in regards to the proposal for trapping regulations and the requirement to place traps at least 50 yards off popular multi-use trail systems. I am a responsible dog owner who loves her pets deeply. I also personally know one of the women who lost their dog to a trap this season and she is beyond devastated. That being said, trapping is a long lived part of Alaskan culture and people's livelihood and I cannot imagine we cannot come to an agreement to decrease dog/trapping interactions. My dogs go to advanced obedience classes regularly and are always on either leash or e-collar, but to say they are perfect and couldn't be baited is a fantasy. I've taken a trapping course to learn the signs that trapping is in the area/how to release pets and we have left areas where we saw snares less than 10 feet off the trail in a very popular area for off leash dogs. That is unacceptable and unethical by trappers. As someone who has done nearly everything I can to mitigate an issue with my own dogs I do feel it is reasonable to ask trappers to move 50 yards off major trails to trap - this is enough space for responsible pet owners to safely keep their pets under control and not feel anxious every time the pet goes into the brush to sniff and simply be a dog. Alaska is a massive state with numerous land for trapping and recreation both - why cannot we not try to accommodate each other? 50 yards is a small walk for most hunters and if you truly enjoy the sport it should not be a major issue.



Submitted By  
Lisa A Wiley  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:30:35 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072234718

Email  
[aklawwiley@gmail.com](mailto:aklawwiley@gmail.com)

Address  
6836 DOUBLE TREE CT  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

I am writing in support of the 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more.

This winter alone, at least seven dogs have been caught in traps, and two of them have been killed in Southcentral Alaska.

I have had to remove two of my dogs from traps during my time in Alaska. Luckily, their injuries were relatively minor.

One of my friends owned the dog who was recently killed. Another of my friend's dog was killed in Cooper Landing from a trap 7 years ago. All dogs who were injured were under voice control and lured to the traps by food placed by the trappers.

Please, support 50 yard trap setbacks to protect our canine families.

Submitted By  
Lucille Zercher  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:45:18 AM  
Affiliation  
none



PC309  
1 of 1

I support the proposal to extend the distance that a animal trap can be set from a multi use trail to at least 50 feet. I know this is just being proposed for the Mat-su Valley but I would also like it to be considered state-wide. I see that there were 7 dogs tramped and 2 killed this season in the valley but I assume there were more that just have not be reported. As the regulations stanfd it makes it so easy for people to set traps and impose their hunting practices on others that have a right to use the land for recreation and wholesome outings with their family and pets. This is a decent compromise and should be passed.

Submitted By  
Maggi Rader  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 4:01:17 PM  
Affiliation



PC310  
1 of 1

While i do no have a problem with trapping I do have a problem with trappers using multi use trails for their lines with no hint that a trapline s present. I am in strong suppot of at least a 50 foot setback or brushing your own line. Trails that are used by multiple people and animals seem like an extremely bad place to allow trapping.



Submitted By  
Mahri Lowinger  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:02:05 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
907-301-4505

Email  
[Mahri.lowinger@gmail.com](mailto:Mahri.lowinger@gmail.com)

Address  
4733 Kupreanof St  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

I support the proposal to set back traps farther from recreational trails where dogs are often on walks or camping and at risk for getting caught.



Submitted By  
Mark E Norquist  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:46:22 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072680727  
Email  
[mcnorquist@gmail.com](mailto:mcnorquist@gmail.com)

Address  
7011 Serenity Circle  
Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Due to the numerous domestic animals that have been caught in traps the past few years, it seems that adding setback for trapping from established trails/trailheads is sorely needed. If a trapper can't get himself a minimum of 50 yards away from a trail he has no business being in the outdoors. Being that a majority of Alaskans dislike the concept of trapping, this would be one small step you could make to give trapping a better reputation. Everyone wins.



Submitted By  
Mark Moglich  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 9:19:28 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
7759016640  
Email  
[mmoglich@aol.com](mailto:mmoglich@aol.com)  
Address  
949 Bar J road  
Gardnerville, Nevada 89410

#### **Proposal I08:**

Summary: Allow non residents "up to five permits for taking, transporting, or possessing an eyas Northern Goshawk for falconry statewide, and up to five permits for taking, transporting, or possessing an eyas Peale's Peregrine from units 1-4, for falconry by a nonresident"

- The AFA (Alaska Falconer's Association) has decided to offer us limited eyas take on one hand, but with very strict restrictions on both eyass and current passage take on the other that is laid out in Proposals 109,110,111.
- Only allowing units 1-4 in a small southern portion of the state, not exclusive to "Peale's Peregrines".
- Exclusion of Gyrfalcon take is based on unfounded claims and or proof by the AFA (Alaska Falconer's Association), which paints non-resident falconers in a negative and criminal light as referenced in their Proposal 110. The AFA maintains the reason for restriction of take to units 1-4, is due to the fact it is difficult for falconers to differentiate between Northern Goshawks, Peale's Peregrine, and Gyrfalcon eyries and eyasses. Experienced falconers can clearly tell the difference.
- We conclude that it is much more difficult to differentiate a Peal's peregrine and a Anatum Peregrine being both peregrines and much easier to see the difference between a Peregrine falcon and a gyrfalcon.
- This excuse to only allow take in units 1-4 is a very weak argument at best.
- Proposal 113 allows 5 Northern Goshawks 5 Peal's Peregrine..e and 5 Gyrfalcon"s either a eyass or a passage raptor statewide as is offered for residents.
- **We do not support proposal 108** and ask that you consider Proposal 113

#### **Proposal I09:**

MICROCHIPPING. "All wild caught live gyrfalcons exported from the state by a nonresident must be microchipped and the microchip must be registered with an internationally recognized microchip registry such as (Petlink)"

- AFA claims that microchipping is "overburdensome", and should only be required for non-resident take.
- AFA shows great concern for protecting what they claim are "highly valuable" Gyrfalcons, yet only the ones taken by non-resident falconers.
- It is clearly stated that the entire lower 48 (Non Residents) can only export up to 5 Gyrfalcons annually, and being wild caught these birds cannot be sold/bartered. Said value of these birds is not monetary
- The AFA is using a poor excuse to exclude themselves from the microchip requirement, which is a regulation they brought onto themselves at the 2017/2018 Game Board meeting. If the microchip process is "overburdensome", as they say, it is a burden they wish only non-residents to endure.
- **We do not support 109** and ask that you continue to microchip all falcons required so they can be tracked inside and outside the state.

#### **Proposal 110:**

Summary: Delay of Non-Resident Passage Take Season to a potentially dangerous time frame.

Currently the non-resident passage take time frame is from August 15-October 31st. The AFA is requesting a DELAY of that time frame (billed falsely as an 'extension') to the dates of September 15 - November 15.

In 2017/18, the proposed start date of September 5th, was denied due to deadly weather concerns and the dangers it posed to non-residents.

The AFA claims this is to "reduce the disturbance of nesting sites", and better align the time taking with the dispersal timing of Gyrfalcons from their "natal areas", but have no desire to change the current resident window, only non-residents.

It should be noted, currently an Alaskan resident can take up to 2 Gyrfalcons a season, within the current time frame.

They do not propose to restrict themselves out of these concerns.

Concerns for white Gyrfalcon harvesting is totally unfounded and backed with no facts since its only residents who are allowed to climb nest and hand pick a white gyrfalcon. Non residents do not climb or disturb nest.

Less than 5 white gyrfalcons have been taken for nonresident draw the first 5 years and most have been either Grey or Silver in color.

Concerns of disturbing the nest sites are overblown. In the last 5 years an average of 2 Gyrfalcons a year were taken by non-residents, and of the 10 total, only 3 were taken near the date of August 15th. No birds were taken direct from the nesting cliff. Non residents don't climb nest only RESIDENTS do!

Within the current timeframe starting August 15 the beginning of non resident take, falcons are fully fledged and hard panned. There is no climbing of nests, or disturbing of nest sites by Non residents.

It should be noted Proposal 114, which is brought forward by the Alaskan Department of Fish and Game, mirrors AFA's Prop 110.

**WE DO NOT Support 110** it's not safe to start the season later as was discussed at the Game Board meeting In

2017/2018.

The AFA, without any proof, using the argument that illegal falconry trade is a reason for further restricting non-resident take. They do not show the same concern for the current resident take, which paints falconers from the lower 48 as being more likely to commit criminal



activities than themselves.

The AFA promotes a false narrative, that there is a specific interest in "white Gyrfalcons".

Captive breeding within the United States, and abroad, has significantly reduced any need or existence of illegal trade. Gyrfalcons are readily available and bred within the US every year, where white F2 generation Gyrfalcon's are regularly advertised for \$4,000 or less. The AFA has chosen to portray a false concern of "illegal falcon trade" activities, in order to restrict the already very minimal non-resident take, yet shows no concerns to restrict themselves for the same reasons. The message is clear, which is that the AFA is telling their Board of Game that non-resident falconers are more likely to commit criminal activities than themselves.

**WE DO NOT Support 110** it's not safe to start the season later as was discussed at the Game Board meeting in 2017/2018



PC313  
2 of 2

### **Proposal 111**

AFA proposes to Limit non resident take of raptors to one every four years. And to limit unsuccessful permittees from applying the following year. The "one in four" management system used in other areas

does NOT apply for a very limited and small number of non resident applicants. The drawing has always had less than 30 non residents apply for the 5 permits and in 2021 less than 20. Applying

once every 4 years would greatly reduce the number of applicants to almost zero after a few years.

### **We do NOT support Proposal 111**

#### **Proposal 114 (Alaska Game and FISH)**

They propose to change season dates from August 15 start to September 15 start date

Proposal 114 is essentially the same as that offered by AFA's Proposal 114.

All my comments on proposal 110 apply to this proposal 114

As noted in my proposal 110 comments, the delay of take season makes it extremely hazardous

for a permittee which is why a similar proposal was turned down in 2017

### **DO NOT Support 114** it's not safe to start the season later as was discussed at the Game Board

- It should be noted Proposal 114, which is brought forward by the Alaskan Department of Fish and Game, mirrors AFA's Prop 110. in 2017/2018.

### **Proposal 113 (California Hawking Club)**

- I ask that you pass Proposal 113 to allow the take of 5 Northern Goshawks, 5 Peal's Peregrines and 5 Gyrfalcons. For non residents statewide. Please refer to our proposal with facts to back our proposal for non resident take.
- Please consider proposal 113 as a common ground compromise which includes the 5 eyass take of Goshawks and Peales as the AFA is in support in proposal 108.
- **I SUPPORT PROPOSAL 113**



Submitted By  
Bernadette Martel  
Submitted On  
1/19/2022 8:44:21 AM  
Affiliation  
AK citizen

Phone  
907-223-6414  
Email  
[martelbernadette@yahoo.com](mailto:martelbernadette@yahoo.com)  
Address  
12120 Horseshoe drive  
4  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

PLEASE reconsider minimizing traps set off trail by at LEAST 50 yards. 100 is better. Also please consider extending the limitations of the Anchorage Bowl out to the most common trails used in Chugiak and Peters Creek by implementing these distances of 50-100yards minimum. Also please consider enforcing/ requiring all traps be labelled and marked/signed to alert other users of it's presence AT the site of the trap and NOT just at the TH. Baited traps will attract nearly ANY dog, well trained or not. Considering the large population changes to the State of Alaska, changes in demographics, new and increased users and recreationalists to backcountry trails/ areas, and increased competition to retain skilled and competent workers, why not adopt similar regulations of some of our sister Western Trapping States, such as WY, ID, MT, MI, MN, WA, CO and AZ? IF our State is to continue to grow and improve economically, our regulations for such activities NEED to be updated to meet our NEWLY growing population within the State, or else risk losing out to most young, healthy, and educated potential citizens and workers that may choose to live elsewhere DUE to the concern and love for their families and pets at risk.

Submitted By  
Marybeth S Holleman  
Submitted On  
2/19/2022 8:16:31 AM  
Affiliation



PC315  
1 of 1

I support trap setbacks from popular multi-use trails in the MatSu area. I know too many friends who've lost dogs to traps in the Valley. These are responsible pet owners who love their dogs. Trappers need to have respect for other trail users, and cede some trails to multipurpose.



Submitted By  
Patrick P McCormick  
Submitted On  
2/1/2022 5:06:52 PM  
Affiliation  
Chugach view outfitters

Phone  
9072407285  
Email  
[mccormick.patrick@gmail.com](mailto:mccormick.patrick@gmail.com)  
Address  
2700 w31st  
Anchorage, Alaska 99517

I support this regulation with revision. It is imperative to the continuation of trapping in Alaska that trapping happens in a way that does not impact other user groups, it is clear that there are many trappers in south central Alaska who are setting traps that essentially can only catch domestic dogs.

I think there are alternate solutions that do not entirely close trapping in areas such as the palmer hay flats and ensure that ethical trappers are allowed to continue.

I think that trapping should continue to be allowed in the areas mentioned however to end conflicts with other users, except

***Conibear traps may not be set unless fully submerged or placed above the ground.***

*(7) One quarter mile of permanent dwellings, which are defined as buildings used primarily as permanent residences or businesses; but which definition does not include cabins with less than 800 square feet of livable space which are unoccupied a majority of the time. (8) 50 yards of a developed hiking trail or groomed ski trail. Developed hiking trails are defined as trails for which public funds have been spent within the previous five years for construction and maintenance; and groomed ski trails are defined as trails which are routinely maintained and groomed to provide the public with recreational skiing venues. A list of developed hiking trails and groomed ski trails shall be maintained by the department. (9) One quarter mile from the trailhead for any developed hiking trail or groomed ski trail. (10) One quarter mile from any developed campground. Developed campgrounds are defined as campgrounds for which public funds have been spent in the previous five years for construction or maintenance; a list of which shall be maintained by the department.*

By prohibiting ground set conibears there will be virtually no downside for trappers as the option to use non lethal traps still exist, trapping opportunity will not be eliminated in any way and the problem of insidentally killing domestic dogs will be eliminated. This would be a huge win win for both trappers and dog owners.

Submitted By  
Megan E Swearingen  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:43:59 AM  
Affiliation



PC317  
1 of 1

Hello Gentlepersons who may read my letter,

I personally find trapping the most inhumane and cruel practice that only seems to benefit humans, while animals found in traps must suffer an imminent painful and agonizing death. It is yet another example of humans exerting their power and control over animals. I feel traps should be banned completely. I am aware, however, that subsistence cultures rely on traps for survival, and I feel that is the only exception that should be made. Saying that I support that traps should be placed farther out from trails to protect people and pets only serves to protect domestic animals for people's benefit. Protecting only animals that people consider worthy is a disservice to animals that are wild, but still experience pain. This inhumane practice should be reduced and eliminated except for those who lack other resources. Far too many trappers are poaching their animals for hides at a high price. If animals in traps are caught, they should only be suffering in the name of providing nourishment and survival for a subsistent community. Please consider reducing and eliminating traps altogether except for subsistence cultures.

Respectfully,

Megan



Submitted By  
Meghan Johnson  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 2:49:11 PM  
Affiliation  
Hiker and Skier

Phone  
9073607384  
Email  
[meegorama@yahoo.com](mailto:meegorama@yahoo.com)  
Address  
2610 Porter Place  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

To Whom It May Concern,

Since January of 2022 I know of three friends who have had an encounter with a trap and their family pet (dog). One of these three resulted in a traumatic fatality with a conibear trap. I am not against trapping as this is part of Alaska's culture. However, I am a strong advocate for co-recreating in this beautiful state. I have two dogs and one will never be off leash in public due to some special needs he has and the other one is smart, under voice command and like to let him run and be a dog. I always have leashes with me but some of the trap release kits are heavy and bulky and really add extra unwanted weight to what I carry for a hike. Trapping close to well used hiking trails puts house pets (dogs) at risk, not to mention the traumatic impact on the pet owners. Please implement a 150-200 foot set back rule and signage indicating when and where traps are set.

Thank you

Meghan Johnson

Dog owner, hiker, and skier

Submitted By  
Melinda Myers  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 6:36:42 PM  
Affiliation



PC319  
1 of 1

Dear Board of Game,

My name is Melinda Myers and I am writing in support of the proposed 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. Currently, it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May. I continue to hear about dogs being caught in these traps. Just about a month ago an acquaintance's dog was killed in Southcentral, and hearing the trauma the family experienced was heart wrenching. Watching their dog die in front of them because of the dangerous trap and their inability to release and save their animal. No one should have to witness that and really, no animal should be trapped that way. There is no reason for them to be that close to highly used trails. What if a child or adult had wandered off the trail? We know that would provoke a change. Please increase the setback to protect both animals and people. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Melinda Myers

Submitted By  
Michelle scaman  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 10:15:50 PM  
Affiliation



PC320  
1 of 1

I support the legislation proposing 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. Currently, it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May.





Submitted By  
Mindee Sayer  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 2:38:20 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9075295989  
Email  
[Mindee@gci.net](mailto:Mindee@gci.net)

Address  
256 E Leota St  
Wasilla, Alaska 99654

I support and encourage the proposal requiring trapping in multi use areas to be no closer than 50 yards from trails. This proposal provides a make sense precaution to protect domestic pets and people sharing these areas. Requiring fatal traps to be placed further from trails will decrease accidental injuries/death, with minimal work or inconvenience to the trapper. This proposed solution seems to consider all users & safety concerns of a shared/multi use area, both providing enhanced safety and peace of mind for families and recreational users while still supporting trapping options for trappers. We live near the Palmer Hayflats and after recently learning a dog who was killed in the area As a result of a trap, I have been unwilling to use the area with my pets, as I am unwilling to risk such a tragedy. That said, under the current situation, it seems trappers have no risk, while families & pets, assume all the risk when using these areas. In order for multi use area to be accessible and safe for multiple uses, it seems such proposed measures would help ensure this area can be used, safely, by all and reduce the risk of accidental injury or death due to proximity to trails.

Submitted By  
Mr. Ed Bennett  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 8:10:21 AM  
Affiliation



PC322  
1 of 1

50yds is a start. 1/4mile with a sign is more realistic for safety.



Submitted By  
Nelson Wadman  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 10:51:46 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
971-227-8503  
Email  
[Wadmnels@gmail.com](mailto:Wadmnels@gmail.com)

Address  
1701 Beaver PI  
Anchorage, Alaska 97401

I am a bird and small game hunter and I do most of my hunting in the Mat-Su area because it is relatively close to my home and there is an abundance of small game. I would love to bring my dog with me as he is now old enough to start hunting with me. However, the stories I have heard from other hunters who hunt with dogs, as well as hikers who stick to the trails, about their dogs getting killed or permanently injured by traps make me not want to take my dog out hunting. I would much rather save my dog, and my money, and forgo the hunting season all together. I would feel much more comfortable if I had an idea of where traps might be placed in relation to the trails that I use to go hunting. I realize the risk of going off trail, and I accept that risk. But the fact that there is no formal regulation to keep traps a set distance off of trails is deeply concerning to me. I am by no means against trapping. I do not wish to ban trapping. I do believe that there needs to be a compromise so that trapping can continue to happen. As a hunter, I am subject to certain laws and regulations about where I can hunt in order to keep others safe. Trappers should have similar laws and regulations about where they are allowed to trap for the very same reason. I believe that a required distance off of public trails is a wonderful compromise. It is a compromise that would make me feel comfortable enough to take my dog hunting with me, because at least I would know where I could expect traps to be. Right now I have no idea where a trap might be, and that makes me scared for my dog, who I consider a friend and a member of my family. I know there is much debate about having trap set-backs, and so I would also accept a compromise to require that traps be marked so that trail users such as myself would know that a trap was nearby and that I should exercise caution. As I said before, my goal is not to ban trapping. My goal is to reach a compromise so that trapping can continue in a way that is safe for all who use and enjoy the outdoors.



Submitted By  
Novalene Payne  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 1:20:13 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9077076598  
Email  
[novalenepayne@gmail.com](mailto:novalenepayne@gmail.com)  
Address  
4650 Reka Dr  
Unit F17  
Anchorage , Alaska 99508

Hello,

As someone who has lived in Alaska since 2014 I have had the wonderful opportunity to take advantage of the wonderful park and trail systems that make our state so unique. I hope to continue to recreate with my husband and our future family but the fact that Alaska still allows trappers to have un restricted access to all land here is very unsettling. A phrase I hear pro trappers rebute with is "just leash your dog." While yes all pets should be leashed, hunting dogs are allowed off leash. Personally, I walk my dog on a long retractable leash, with Alaskas laws he could still wander into a trap, which is a something that is always on my mind. Being completely honest, this issue is about more than dogs. It's about my husband and I, should we have to fear every time we're recreating and decide to explore the area and/or go off trail about stepping into traps? Should I have to worry about my future children when they're too young to understand the dangers? For too long Alaskas laws have remained archaic.

Personally, I only believe trapping should be allow for the Indigenous Peoples of Alaska and those needing to subsistence hunt in remote areas. As we all know trapping is the least humane method of hunting but I understand in certain circumstances it should be allowed.

Please take time to think over losing a beloved pet or maybe your own foot when making a decision about regulations.

Thank you so much for your time.

Signed,

A Concerned Alaskan

Submitted By

Paige

Submitted On

2/17/2022 7:27:11 AM

Affiliation



PC325  
1 of 1

I would like traps to be set further back for the safety of humans and their pets.

Submitted By  
Patricia  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 3:00:54 PM  
Affiliation



PC326  
1 of 1

Life long Alaskan, 4th generation and have owned many dogs who I'd take out and play on many of our trails. I do not agree with trapping and can't imagine losing a pet in that way. Please remove the traps. Thank you for your time

Submitted By  
Phyllis A Kopiasz  
Submitted On  
2/17/2022 7:04:10 AM  
Affiliation



PC327  
1 of 1

Please adopt new measures to protect citizens, children and pets. Too many have been killed, maimed and injured due to traps set too close to hiking trails. I know some of the worst incidents have involved legally-set traps where the trapper was either too lazy or indifferent to hike further into the woods, away from popular trails.

Please adopt new regulations to protect the majority of law-abiding citizens from the economic interests of wildlife killers.



Submitted By  
Rebekah Morisse  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:27:32 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072424254

Email  
[rebekah.morisse@gmail.com](mailto:rebekah.morisse@gmail.com)

Address  
2700 Kobuk Ct  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

As a dog owner, lover of the Alaska outdoors, and as someone who comes from a hunting family, I support the ability of people to hunt and trap. I do think that having some setback requirements will allow for people to walk safely with their children and dogs and still allow people to trap. Watching the stories of people who have had their dogs in a trap or who have had their dog die is heartbreaking. I support the 50 yard setback to allow us all to use the trails safely. I have seen traps right next to trails where a child or dog could easily have been harmed, and I don't want anyone to experience that. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.



Submitted By  
Rob Earl  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 3:19:01 PM  
Affiliation



PC329  
1 of 1

Comment to Board of Game:

Trapping should be regulated and limited to certain areas. Obviously. It's dangerous, even if you do keep your dogs leashed. I'm offended that traps randomly strewn across the landscape restrict my freedom of the hills. Unregulated trapping is a danger to myself and my family. Trapping must be regulated. Frankly, I don't see that happening as long as the Board of Game is full of trappers and hunters. Eventually this will change (maybe sooner than you think!) and the Legislature will make the Board of Game more balanced. In the meantime, trapping supporters should see the writing on the wall work on some reasonable regulations. The fact that its legal to put traps anywhere (including directly on major trails) and that trappers aren't required to flag their traplines is RIDICULOUS. I mean, seriously? It's 2022 ladies and gentlemen. Get with the program. It's called "civilization". We live in one. Or we should be! Regulate trapping now, or maybe lose the privelege to trap altogether later on. Thank you for your work and Godspeed.



Submitted By  
Roy J Wilson  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 8:19:56 PM  
Affiliation  
Voter/tax payer  
  
Phone  
9072996619  
Email  
[rjwilson5@alaska.edu](mailto:rjwilson5@alaska.edu)  
Address  
40951 Kat ct b136  
Homer  
Homer, Alaska 99603

First fallrun@sonic.net is a valid email the one you accepted is almost never used. It is obscene for any traps to be set closer than 1/4 mile of public use areas. The current regulations are another example of government welfare to special interest groups. Let the traders earn their money like the rest of us rather than sucking at the public tit.



Submitted By  
RR Mier  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 12:43:13 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
6162960762  
Email  
[rajaju57@gmail.com](mailto:rajaju57@gmail.com)

Address  
3358 Millard  
Muskegon , Michigan 49441

Proposing 50-yard trap setbacks to increase public safety on popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. Currently, it is legal for traps to be set on or near multi-use trails, campgrounds, roads, and pullouts from as early as September through May.

Submitted By  
Russell Johanson  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 5:19:28 PM  
Affiliation



PC332  
1 of 1

I support a 50-yard setback for trapping on popular multi-use trails. This is a common-sense, reasonsed, measured response to increased use and population growth.

Submitted By  
Ryan Thompson  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 1:45:41 PM  
Affiliation  
resident user



PC333  
1 of 1

Please keep traps a minimum distance from recreational trails to keep pets and kids safe. Now the argument has been about dogs getting hurt or killed, but what will happen if it's a child!?



Submitted By  
Sarah Hurkett  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 11:25:29 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9075751523  
Email  
[s.hurkett@gmail.com](mailto:s.hurkett@gmail.com)

Address  
16921 foothill ave  
eagle river, Alaska 99577

As a recreational trail user with children and dogs, I support trap setbacks to limit detrimental contact between traps and all other trail users.

Submitted By  
Shannon O'Brien  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 9:29:30 PM  
Affiliation



PC335  
1 of 1

I am writing to offer my support to the proposed 50-yard trap setbacks from popular multi-use trails, including those in: Nancy Lakes Recreation Area, Big Lake, Palmer Hayflats, Hatcher Pass, Jim Creek, Talkeetna, Sutton, Glacier, Mat-Su Valley Moose Range, Chickaloon, Government Peak, Knik, Settler's Bay Coastal Park, Willow, Nelchina, and more. I would also support a more lengthy setback for traps. It is important that trappers have their space to trap, but it is also important that our trails and trail boundaries are safe for residents and visitors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Submitted By  
Sheri musgrave  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 2:24:51 PM  
Affiliation



PC336  
1 of 1

I'm in favor of the setback of traps on multiuse trails. Please keep our children and dogs safe.





Submitted By  
tammy vig  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 10:19:26 AM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073516567

Email  
[tas\\_1984@hotmail.com](mailto:tas_1984@hotmail.com)

Address  
16124 ROSENBURG CIR  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577

I am so against trapping being allowed near trails in Mat-Su. I personally know the person whose dog was killed by a trap and she is devastated. Please stop this madness.



Submitted By  
Annette Tomco  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:29:13 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9072324732

Email  
[tomco.annette@gmail.com](mailto:tomco.annette@gmail.com)

Address  
10901 E granite ridge rd  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Please consider this set back on public areas not only for the safety of our dogs but the safety of our children. We are not asking to end trapping but simply it made law that trappers follow their supposed "ethics codes" that is claimed they have but is not followed. Thank you.

Submitted By  
Tyler Jones  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 4:05:44 PM  
Affiliation



PC339  
1 of 1

I am writing to express my support for the 50 yard trap setback from multi-use trails. The fact that it is currently legal to set traps right next to trails where people recreate with their dogs and children is simply astonishing to me. By adopting the 50 yard setback, lives will be saved..



Submitted By

Wendy Howard

Submitted On

2/17/2022 4:02:48 PM

Affiliation

Phone

907-360-8290

Email

[whowardak@hotmail.com](mailto:whowardak@hotmail.com)

Address

8324 Sundi Drive

Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Please set back off trails to protect our furry family members. Thank you!



Submitted By  
April Woods  
Submitted On  
2/16/2022 1:03:22 PM  
Affiliation

Phone  
9073387777

Email  
[ms.april.woods@gmail.com](mailto:ms.april.woods@gmail.com)

Address  
5716 Kennyhill Dr  
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

I know of two people who had their dogs seriously hurt by a trap in the Mat-Su. I think it is very wrong to put the interests of low life trappers over the safety of everyone else. I don't think trappers should be allowed on public or private land, they should only be allowed to trap on their own land. You don't allow people to gold dig in public places, or drill for oil or water, so why allow sociopathic people kill innocent animals on public land, it is wrong, it is dangerous and the innocent lose as the evil win, it is just more bad government.

Submitted By  
Yvette Galbraith  
Submitted On  
2/18/2022 3:01:03 PM  
Affiliation



PC342  
1 of 1

It is time for 50 foot set backs for trapping on ALL trails. And especially in campgrounds, parks, multiuse trails and turn outs. Time for Alaska Board of Game to consider all user groups on Alaska lands. Also time for trappers to have ids on their traps to be accountable. This would help regulate the few who are screwing it up for the others.