18 AUGUST 2006

THE ALASKA CHAPTER OF THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY
TECHNICAL REVIEW

ISSUES RELATED TO THE SALE OF BLACK AND BROWN BEAR PARTS IN ALASKA

Review Committee:

Gail H. Collins (Chair), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 779, Tok, Alaska 99780
Mark R. Bertram, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 101 12th Avenue, Room 264, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
Harry V. Reynolds, International Association for Bear Research and Management, P.O. Box 80843, Fairbanks, Alaska 99708
C. Tom Seaton, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 1300 College Road, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Introduction

In Alaska, wildlife is a public trust resource mandated to be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses (State of Alaska 1959). In 1990, the federal government assumed management of subsistence hunting on federal lands. This resulted in a dual federal / state wildlife management system with different regulations for state and federal lands. In 1994, the Alaska State Legislature passed the Intensive Management Law (State of Alaska 1994) that identified specific big game prey populations to be managed for high levels of human harvest. In 1998, the Statutes further defined high levels of human harvest to as the allocation of a sufficient portion of the harvestable surplus of a game population to achieve a high probability of success for human harvest (State of Alaska 1998*a*). Specifically identified means of achieving high harvest levels included predator control and habitat enhancement. Where evidence points to predation as a limiting factor in ungulate populations, the State of Alaska has enacted management actions to harvest predators at an unsustainable rate with the purpose of population reduction. Brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) have been implicated as the primary predator in some areas; in other areas, it has been American black bears (*U. americanus*), wolves (*Canis lupus*), or a combination of the three (see Boertje et al. 1988, Ballard et al. 1991, Gasaway et al. 1992, Bertram and Vivion 2002, Keech 2005). Several changes have been made or proposed that affect regulations and policies of bear management. Beyond modifying season timing and length, bag limits, and tag fee waivers, enacted or proposed regulatory changes include the sale of bear fur, hides, or other parts, baiting brown bears, same-day-airborne hunting, and harvest of yearlings or females with young.

The stated purpose of allowing the sale of bear parts in Alaska is to provide an economic incentive to increase harvest of both black bears and brown bears (Alaska Board of Game

2006). The intended result is to reduce bear predation on ungulate calves, thereby increasing numbers of ungulates available to hunters in specific areas. However, whether or not legalizing the sale of bear parts would increase bear harvest is unknown. Further, this action may be viewed as commercialization, which, if poorly managed, can lead to overexploitation and biotic impoverishment (Freese and Trauger 2000). Commercialization of wildlife and unregulated trade has contributed to declines in populations and extirpation of species worldwide (e.g., Jennings 1987, Camhi 1995, Fa et al. 1995, Thorbjarnarson 1999, Baker et al. 2000, Wright et al. 2001, Yiming et al. 2003, Stiles 2004). Commercialization is generally prohibited for harvested game species and migratory birds, although the sale of skins from furbearers is allowed. Differences in the commercial value of wildlife often determine how an animal must be salvaged from the field. Bears are primarily valued as trophies for their skins, skulls, and claws. For example, in Alaska, sport hunt guiding for both black and brown bear is a highly profitable commercial industry and bear meat must be salvaged from the field only under some circumstances.

With some exceptions, all eight worldwide species of bears have experienced dramatic population declines in recent decades (McCraken et al. 1995). Exceptions include the American black bear, most Alaskan and Canadian populations of brown bear, and the polar bear (*U. maritimus)*, although the polar bear is currently being considered for threatened status under the Endangered Species Act. The declines are primarily the result of habitat loss and degradation (Servheen 1999), but unregulated hunting and human harvest for the bear parts trade have been contributing factors (Williamson 2002). Aside from their value as an integral component of the ecosystem, bears are also valued for other characteristics. In Europe, North America, and much of Russia, bears are highly valued as a game animal from which hides are tanned or fashioned into rugs. Sales of skulls, teeth, and claws as tourist souvenirs are allowed in some places but are prohibited in others. In some countries, hides can be sold to taxidermists to be made into mounted trophies, wall hangings, or rugs. The transfer of live bears occurs among zoos, wildlife parks, and other facilities with strict regulatory oversight.

In some Asian countries and Asian communities elsewhere in the world, bears parts have been sought for their traditional medicine and food value for thousands of years (McCracken et al. 1995). Bear gallbladders and paws are in particularly high demand in Asian international commercial trade. Such use is thought to be becoming more prevalent throughout Asia and in Asian communities in North America and Europe (Servheen 1999). While dried bile from the gallbladder of bears is one of the most treasured Chinese medicines, bear fat, meat, paws, spinal cord, blood, and bones are also used. Beyond medicinal applications, various parts from bears have value within North America on the international market as trophies, food, souvenirs and for cultural rituals (Williamson 2002). Bear bile from wild bears in Asia has become difficult to obtain because bear populations and habitats have been reduced (Servheen 1999). Bear bile prices vary according to the location of sale, proof of authenticity, and eagerness of the buyer. There is also a considerable amount of counterfeit bear bile for sale throughout the traditional medicine market (Servheen 1999).

Scope and Objectives

We limit the scope of this review to North American black and brown bears. Polar bears are classified as marine mammals managed by the federal government, and as such are not subject to actions by Alaska's game management laws.

In this review we discuss issues associated with the sale and trade of bear parts as they relate to: (1) raising bears in captivity for their parts in Asia (2) the international trade in bear parts; and (3) the current and proposed regulations in the United States (Garshelis 1997) and Canada.

Objectives of this review are to:

1) Describe the prominent national and international issues surrounding the sale and trade of bear parts;

2) Review current regulations in the United States and Canada regarding the sale of bear parts; and,

3) Provide recommendations for management and conservation of bears in Alaska.

Asian Bear Farms

China began establishing captive bear farms for gallbladder bile extraction in 1984 and other countries in south Asia soon followed. The purpose of these farms, which primarily raise Asiatic black bears (*U. thibetanus*), is to satisfy China's demand for bear bile without removing bears from the wild. A second purpose is to ensure the authenticity of bile available on the open market. Both maintaining captive bears for bile production and the conditions under which they are kept are unacceptable to some individuals (Garshelis 1997).

The value of captive bear farms to conservation is unknown and often viewed with skepticism (Garshelis 1997, Servheen 1999). It is unclear if these farms serve their intended purpose of relieving the demand for parts from wild bears or whether, as believed by many western trade authorities, these farms legitimize and promote the use of bile (Garshelis 1997, Servheen 1999).

While bile from captive bears most likely replaces some bile from wild bears in the market, the demand for wild bear bile continues. This is due in part because many users consider bile from wild bears to be more potent (Mills and Servheen 1991) and thus more valuable. Bile from wild Asian bears is also preferred to that of North American bears (Garshelis 1997). The fact that farmed bile is of less value medicinally and commercially suggests that there will continue to be demand for bile from wild bears regardless of the

success of farming (Servheen 1999). Further, bear farms require considerable investment and capital. Competition resulting from the many farms in China reduces the price, resulting in increased marketing and promotion. This legitimization has the potential to further increase the acceptability of the bear bile trade (Servheen 1999).

International Trade in Bear Parts

The primary international mechanism controlling the trade of bear parts is the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). All species and populations of bears are listed in either Appendix I or II of CITES (Garshelis 1997).

American black bear – status

With the exception of the Louisiana and Florida subspecies, black bear populations in North America are the only bear species considered to be thriving throughout most of its current range (Williamson 2002). Although the species has been extirpated from parts of its historical range, black bears continue to inhabit much of Canada and large areas of the United States.

American black bear – trade in Asia

Commercialization of American black bear parts has become a concern, especially the trade in gallbladders for use in traditional Asian medicines and paws for food. In the early 1990s, apprehension that bear parts from protected Asian species were entering the market falsely labeled as American black bears led to national and international action (Williamson 2002). The American black bear was first listed on CITES by Canada in 1991, with the United States listing the species in 1992. As a result, commercial exports of gallbladders, paws, or other parts of American black bears requires a permit from federal CITES management authorities. The intent of the listing was to enable enforcement personnel in Asia to distinguish legally imported bear parts from illegally obtained parts of endangered species (Garshelis 1997). It is unclear whether this listing has curbed illegal trade, although indicators are that it has not. For example, between 1992 and 1997, only one gallbladder was legally exported to Asia from the United States, whereas massive illegal shipments of farmed bile from China have been intercepted coming into the United States (Garshelis 1997).

Little qualitative information exists on the contribution of parts from American black bears to the Asian medicinal trade or the magnitude of commercialization of black bear parts within North America. Official statistics on the global trade of bear parts are difficult to obtain (McCracken et al. 1995). Given the lack of data on trade for American black bear parts, much of the available evidence of trade for medicinal use has been obtained through undercover investigations. These investigations suggest the existence of extensive and sophisticated networks of hunters, intermediaries, retailers, and buyers (Klein 1982, Gavitt 1989). The scale of both legal and illegal trade of black bear gallbladders and other parts remain unclear. The reasons for this include the difficulties

associated with distinguishing legally taken bears from poached bears, determining the destination of bear parts in trade, and the weakness of mechanisms to collect and exchange information (McCracken et al. 1995).

Acquiring reliable information to determine Asian price trends for bear gallbladders has also proved difficult. Reported retail prices in Asia have been as high as $15,000 in Korea, while others have reportedly sold for well under $1,000 (Mills and Servheen 1991). The wide range in price is likely related to consumer preferences and whether the bile is from farm-raised or wild bears.

American black bear – trade in North America

Espinoza et al. (1995) reported that chemical analysis of bear bile from Asia indicated that while gallbladders from North American bears ended up on domestic markets, they rarely ended up on overseas markets. However, in at least one example, a multi-year undercover investigation in 2004 established a direct connection of illegal trade in American black bear parts between Virginia, the Mid-Atlantic States, and South Korea (Shenandoah National Park 2004). In 1995, retail prices for whole dried gallbladders in the United States ranged from $75 to $600 (McCracken et al. 1995). In 2005, the estimated market value for a bear gall bladder sold illegally in Alaska was $350 (B. Waldron, State of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska, personal communication, 2005).

The bulk of the legal trade in American black bear parts is between the United States and Canada for trophies (considered noncommercial trade by CITES), skins, and claws (McCracken et al. 1995). Annually, several hundred raw black bear hides are sold at auctions. In 2005 the average was $51 each with a top price of $185 (North American Fur Auctions, Press Release, February 14, 2005). Retail prices online for an American black bear rug crafted by a taxidermist during the same year ranged from $550 to $1,400. Retail prices online in 2005 were approximately $80 for a black bear skull and $10 each for claws. In most states, guides earn thousands of dollars to arrange and guide hunts (McCracken et al. 1995). In states allowing the sale of American black bear gallbladders and paws, these items are often collected as a by-product of black bear harvest by hunting outfitters. Consequently, it is unlikely in those states that enough economic incentive exists for large-scale harvest for bear parts.

Brown bear – status

North American populations of brown bears are thought to be stable in Alaska, Yukon Territory, and parts of Alberta and British Columbia. Populations in the United States, outside of Alaska, were extirpated from most of their historical range by the 1930s and were listed under the Endangered Species Act in 1975. However, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recently proposed to remove brown bears from threatened status in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem in parts of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho (U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 2005).

Brown bear – trade in Russia

No information is available regarding the international trade in brown bear parts originating from North America. The Russian Far East has been a long-time source of brown bear gallbladders for traditional oriental medicines (Chestin 1998). Historically the market was poorly developed and most trade was through barter. However, during the mid-1990s the trade of gallbladders increased significantly when impoverished local communities discovered the high economic incentives resulting from poaching. For example, in 1991, the sale of a single gallbladder could support a family for almost half a year (Chestin 1998). During the early 1990s, the number of brown bears illegally harvested on the Kamchatka Peninsula was estimated at 2 times the number of legally taken bears (Chestin 1994). Although some information indicates that poaching of brown bears for their parts in the Russian Far East has declined substantially, data are not available to substantiate this perspective (H. Reynolds, International Association for Bear Research and Management, Fairbanks, Alaska, personal communication, 2005).

Brown bear – trade in North America

Retail prices online in 2005 ranged $1,800 – $4,300 for a brown bear rug, although much of the price represents taxidermy fees. Between 1999 and 2003, 12 grizzly [brown] bear pelts sold in Canada for an average price of $807 US (range $183 to $1,763 US) (Elward and Alain 2004). Each year, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game consigns brown bear hides salvaged from defense-of-life-or-property takes, hunter confiscations, or road-killed bears to be auctioned by the Alaska Trappers Association. From 1998 to 2006, 127 preserved and dried brown bear hides were sold for an average price of $343 (T. Seaton, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fairbanks, Alaska, personal communication, 2006). Raw brown bear hides may also be purchased for the value of the claws alone. The average retail price online in 2005 for brown bear claws was $25 each, skulls averaged $300 each, and teeth were sold for around $10 each.

Bear Regulations in the Continental United States and Canada

In addition to federal and CITES regulations governing international trade and certain interstate commerce in wild animals and plants, the legality of trade within the United States and Canada also falls under the authority of state, provincial, and territorial laws (Williamson 2002). In the United States, the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 prohibit the import, export, transport, sale, purchase, receipt, or acquisition of wildlife taken, possessed, transported, or sold in violation of a state, federal, foreign, or tribal law or regulation.

American black bear

Resident populations of the American black bear in the United States and Canada inhabit 41 states and 11 provinces or territories. Most states and provinces with resident American black bear populations allow them to be hunted. In 2002, only 15 states

prohibited the killing of black bears under almost all circumstances (Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Texas; Williamson 2002). However, both Maryland and New Jersey have recently initiated black bear hunting seasons due to the growth of their bear populations.

In the United States, 46 states regulate trade in American black bear parts, including gallbladders, paws, claws, teeth, heads, skulls, and hides (Williamson 2002). Nineteen of those states do not allow the sale of any bear parts. Rationale for not allowing the sale or trade of bear parts is related to concerns about impacts to populations. For example, in California, state wildlife law seeks to ensure that there is no potential for profit motive in wildlife harvest. Under California state law, possession of more than one bear gallbladder serves as evidence of intent to sell, which is a felony (State of California 2005). Laws among the other states vary on a part-by-part basis (Table 1). Thirty-five states prohibit selling of gallbladders, 32 states prohibit the sale of paws, and 26 states prohibit the sale of claws and teeth. The most permissive trade is in heads and hides, which is prohibited in only 19 states. In Canada, 11 of the 12 provinces have laws governing the trade in black bear parts (Table 1). Two provinces allow the sale of gallbladders, 4 allow the sale of paws, 6 allow the sale of teeth and claws, and almost all provinces allow the sale of heads and hides, with some restrictions (Williamson 2002).

State, provincial, and territorial wildlife managers were surveyed to assess the impact of selling or trading American black bear parts in the U.S. and Canada (Williamson 2002). Respondents suggested that, with a few exceptions, trade in black bear parts was not perceived by wildlife managers to be having a significant impact on the harvest of black bears. These assessments were generally consistent with an upward trend in black bear populations in both countries during the survey period, and a corresponding increase in the level of legal harvest (Williamson 2002). In 2005, individuals from Idaho and Colorado assisting with the review by the Alaska Chapter of The Wildlife Society had viewpoints consistent with those reported by Williamson (2002). Arizona respondents to Williamson (2002) stated that trade was not having an impact on the bear population. However, others believe that poaching of black bears for gallbladders in Arizona was significant in the mid 1980s – 1990s, and that the bear population in the surrounding area had not recovered from the impact (J. Perry, Arizona Game and Fish, Tucson, Arizona, personal communication, 2005). In New Mexico, which was not included in Williamson (2002), there was substantial use of bear parts by jewelers, however the bear population was stable and there was little effort by law enforcement to track illegal sale (R. Winslow, New Mexico Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, personal communication, 2005).

Quantifying the level of American black bear poaching and illegal trade in the United States and Canada is subjective and difficult. Most states and provinces do not keep records of reported black bear poaching that involves removal of only the gallbladder and/or paws (Williamson 2002). Between 1989 and 1995, 21 states and 5 provinces conducted some level of bear trade investigation (Williamson 2002). Most states (84%)

cite and incarcerate individuals convicted of illegal take of black bears. Canadian penalties tend to be more severe than those in the United States (Williamson 2002).

Brown bear

In the United States, only Alaska allows brown bear hunting (see below). All Canadian provinces or territories with populations of brown bears allow hunting. Canada also allows trade of brown bear parts; however, sales are relatively restrictive. Alberta allows the sale of brown bear skins if registered by the hunter, and only 2 skins are allowed to be registered for sale over a lifetime. British Columbia does not differentiate between black and brown bears but does not allow the possession, import, export, or trafficking of bear gallbladders, bear genitalia, or paws separated from the hide. However, regulations in British Columbia will likely become more restrictive in the future (M. Austin, Ministry of Water, Land, and Air Protection, Victoria, B.C., personal communication, 2005). Trade regulations in the Yukon Territory are also not specific to black or brown bears. However, permits are required and may only be issued for a bear hide with claws attached. Gallbladders or teeth removed from skull cannot be legally sold. The Yukon Territory is also considering more restrictive policies and regulations to eliminate all commercial incentives for wildlife harvest, except for between First Nations individuals (J. Russell, Yukon Department of Environment, Whitehorse, Yukon, personal communication, 2005).

Bear Regulations in Alaska

As early as 1908, the Alaska Territory classified brown bears as a game species and made it unlawful to sell hides or heads (Title X, Chapter 1, Section 330, Joint Committee on Territories of the Senate and House of Representatives 1913). Grizzly bears were added as a game species in 1925 (Law Revision Board 1933). Although they are the same species (*U. arctos*), larger coastal bears are commonly referred to as brown bears and smaller interior bears are generally referred to as grizzlies. Black bears were originally defined as land fur-bearing animals but were reclassified as a game species in 1938 (Alaska Game Commission 1935, Sherwood 1981). In 1939, Alaska regulation allowed for the purchase and sale of black bear hides, items made from black bear hides, and fur ruffs made from grizzly bears in certain fur districts (Alaska Game Commission 1939). Between 1961 and 1971, the State of Alaska prohibited the purchase, sale, or barter of grizzly bears, brown bears, or black bears (State of Alaska 1961, 1964, 1971). In 1998, state regulations were changed to allow the sale of handicrafts from black bear fur (State of Alaska 1998*b*).

In 2005, the Federal Subsistence Board in Alaska ruled that qualified subsistence users could sell handicraft articles made from the skin, hide, pelt, or fur (including claws) of black and brown bears harvested from selected federal lands. Then in 2006, Alaska's State Board of Game ruled to allow the sale of untanned brown bear and black bear hides (claws attached) and skulls from bears harvested on state lands within active predator control areas. The intent was to provide hunters with additional incentives to harvest bears from these areas. But because neither state nor federal land managers have tracking

or monitoring systems in place, enforcement of these new regulations is problematic. Of significance is the inability to ensure that parts of bears harvested from outside allowed areas are not sold illegally.

Bear Management and the Sale of Bear Parts in Alaska

Although black and brown bear populations in Alaska are generally thought to be stable, population size or rates of harvest are uncertain for many areas. In other areas, bear populations are currently harvested near maximum sustained yield, especially those with good road or trail access and near urban areas (Alaska Department of Fish and Game 2002, 2003). Techniques currently available for statistically-based population estimates of bears include mark-recapture, line transect, and genetic analysis (Miller et al. 1997, Quang and Becker 1997, Peacock 2004). However, there has been no widespread use of such scientifically rigorous methods to estimate bear population sizes, especially in forested environments. Bear management in most Game Management Units in Alaska is based on trends in harvest data, and regulated through adjustments to season dates and bag limits. In some management units, trend data are used in concert with extrapolation of population size from units with similar habitats (Alaska Department of Fish and Game 2002, 2003).

Sole use of harvest data to assess changes in population size can be problematic, especially for brown bears (Harris and Metzgar 1987*a*, 1987*b*). For example, declines in the mean age of harvested bears can be interpreted in two ways: (1) the population has been subjected to high levels of harvest and is in a steep rate of decline so that few older bears are present in the population; or (2) the population is growing so rapidly and is so highly productive that the largest cohorts available to hunters are composed of younger bears. If the sale of bear parts is intended as a tool for reducing bear populations, it will be vital to adequately monitor when population objectives have been achieved.

On the whole, black bears are generally more abundant than brown bears, have a higher reproductive potential, have less trophy value, and are already subject to liberal regulations without general conservation concern. Because of this, the potential for significant population reduction associated with the sale of parts is expected to be less for most populations of black bears than for brown bears. However, because brown bears have a high trophy value, the commercialization of brown bear parts (especially hides, skulls, and claws) may provide enough economic incentive in Alaska for increased harvest. In Alaska, cases involving the illegal take of gallbladders and bear trophies have increased in recent years (S. Tuttle, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska, personal communication, 2005). For example, in 2004, several Alaskan residents were convicted in cases involving the illegal harvest of black bears for their gall bladders, including the intent to export the parts to South Korea (Federal Wildlife Officers Association 2005).

Increased economic incentive to harvest brown bears could result in reduced brown bear populations in affected areas. If the sale of black and brown bear parts in Alaska is restricted to focused geographical areas and used to achieve specific and measurable

population management goals, the effect on other bear populations in the state should be minimal. However, effective steps must be taken to preclude the sale of bear parts harvested from within prohibited areas. Without such steps, management could become problematic because of the potential inaccuracy of available harvest data.

Conclusions

Garshelis (1997) makes the point that it is not the killing of bears, nor the use of their gallbladders that has jeopardized the survival of Asian species. Rather, it is the fact that Asian countries have not developed a mechanism for doing this in a sustainable way that protects populations from decline. Both American black bear populations in North America and brown bear populations in Alaska and parts of Canada are considered healthy. However, as wild bears in Asia continue to decline, the demand for bear parts from North America could increase (Servheen 1999). Similarly, it is unknown if or how the availability of bear parts from Asian farms affects the demand for wild bears. North American bears have been a source of bear parts used in Asia and in Asian communities in the United States and Canada (Servheen 1999). Demand for bile among Asians, the farming of bile, and export of legal bear parts from North America could serve to lower the price and thereby stimulate more demand. Alternatively, increased availability of legal bear parts from North America could serve to lower pressures on endangered species. Closing legal markets could have the opposite consequence of raising prices; thereby stimulating poaching and illegal trade (Williamson 2002). Studies have not been undertaken to assess supply and demand (Garshelis 1997), and this range of possible scenarios highlights the complexity of this issue.

Literature Review

Alaska Board of Game. 2006. Proposal No. 21: Allow trapping of black bear, and sale of hides and skulls. Summary of Actions, Statewide Cycle A. January 27-29, 2006. Anchorage, Alaska, USA.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Black bear management report of survey-inventory activities 1 July 1998–30 June 2001. C. Healy, editor. Project 17.0. Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 2003. Brown bear management report of survey-inventory activities 1 July 2000 30 June 2002. C. Healy, editor. Project 4.0. Juneau, Alaska, USA.

Alaska Game Commission. 1935. Regulations relating to the game and fur animals and birds in Alaska, 1935-1936. Circular #12. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Biological Survey, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1939. Regulations relating to the game and fur animals and birds in Alaska, 1939-1940. Circular #17. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Biological Survey. Juneau, Alaska, USA.

Baker, C. S., G. M. Lento, F. Capriano, and S. R. Palumbi. 2000. Predicted decline of protected whales based on molecular genetic monitoring of Japanese and Korean markets. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London 267:1191-1199.

Ballard, W. B., J. S. Whitman, and D. J. Reed. 1991. Population dynamics of moose in south-central Alaska. Wildlife Monographs 114:1–49.

Bertram, M. R., and M. T. Vivion. 2002. Moose mortality in eastern Interior Alaska. Journal of Wildlife Management 66:747–756.

Boertje, R. D., W. C. Gasaway, D. V. Grangaard, and D. G. Kelleyhouse. 1988. Predation on moose and caribou by radio-collared grizzly bears in east central Alaska. Canadian Journal of Zoology 66:2492–2499.

Camhi, M. 1995. Industrial fisheries threaten ecological integrity of the Galapagos Islands. Conservation Biology 9:715-719.

Chestin, I. E. 1994. Evaluation of conservation problems on Kamchatka. Final Report. World Wildlife Fund Project RU0011. Moscow – Petropavlovsk, Russia.

_____. 1998. Trade in brown bear gall bladders in Russia. Ursus 10:161-166.

Elward, M., and B. Alain, editors. 2004. Fur statistics. Catalogue number 23-013-XIE, Volume 1, Number 1. Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, Minister of Industry, Ottawa, Canada.

Espinoza, E., J. Shafer, and L. Hagey. 1995. The unbearable facts about the (vile) bile trade. Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Trade of Bear Parts for Medicinal Use. Traffic USA, World Wildlife Fund, Washington D.C., USA.

Fa, J. E., J. Juste, J. Perez del Val, J. Castroviejo. 1995. Impact of market hunting on mammal species in Equatorial Guinea. Conservation Biology 9:1107-1115.

Federal Wildlife Officers Association. 2005. Two sentenced in bear gall case / three plead guilty to another bear gall case. The Federal Wildlife Officer 19(1): 1-6.

Freese, C. H., and D. L. Trauger. 2000. Wildlife markets and biodiversity conservation in North America. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:42-51.

Garshelis, D. 1997. The arrogance of ignorance – a commentary on the bear trade. International Bear News 6:4-6.

Gasaway, W. C., R. D. Boertje, D. V. Grangaard, D. G. Kelleyhouse, R. O. Stephenson, and D. G. Larsen. 1992. The role of predation in limiting moose at low densities

in Alaska and Yukon and implications for conservation. Wildlife Monographs 120:1–59.

Gavitt, J. 1989. Unlawful commercialization of wildlife parts. Paper presented at the 1989 North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington D.C., USA.

Harris, R., and L. Metzgar. 1987*a*. Estimating harvest rates of bears from sex ratio changes. Journal of Wildlife Management 51:802-811.

_____and _____. 1987*b*. Harvest age structures as indicators of decline in small populations of grizzly bears. International Conference on Bear Research and Management 7:109-116.

Jennings, M. R. 1987. Impact of the curio trade for San Diego horned lizards (*Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillii*) in the Los Angeles Basin, California: 1885-1930. Journal of Herpetology 21:356-358.

Keech, M, P. 2005. Factors limiting moose at low density in Unit 19D East; and response of moose to wolf control. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration. Grants W-27-5, 33-1, 33-2, 33-3. Project 1.58. Research Final Report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

Klein, W. E. 1982. An enlightening and sobering experience in California. Paper presented to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. April 1982.

Law Revision Board. 1933. General laws of territory of Alaska. Daily Alaska Empire Publishers, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

McCracken, C., D. A. Rose, and K. A. Johnson. 1995. Status, management, and commercialization of the American black bear (*Ursus americanus*). Traffic USA, World Wildlife Fund, Washington D.C., USA.

Miller, S. D., G. C. White, R. A. Sellers, H. V. Reynolds, J. W. Schoen, K.Titus, V. G. Barnes Jr., R. B. Smith, R. R. Nelson, W. B. Ballard, and C. C. Schwartz. 1997. Brown and black bear density estimation in Alaska using radiotelemetry and replicated mark-resight techniques. Wildlife Monographs 133.

Mills, J. A., and C. Servheen. 1991. The Asian trade in bears and bear parts. Traffic USA, World Wildlife Fund, Washington D.C., USA.

Quang, P. X., and E. F. Becker. 1997. Combining line transect and double-count sampling techniques for aerial surveys. Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics 2:230-242.

Peacock, L. 2004. Population, genetic and behavioral studies of black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in Southeast Alaska. Dissertation, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Servheen, C. 1999. The trade in bears and bear parts. Pages 33-38 In C. Servheen, S. Herrero, and B. Peyton, compilers. Bears: Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan. IUCN/SSC Bear Specialist Group.

Shenandoah National Park. 2004. Joint undercover operation links International black market to Virginia Mountain. Shenandoah National Park News, January 7, 2004. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Shenandoah National Park, Luray, Virginia, USA.

Sherwood, M. 1981. Big game in Alaska, a history of wildlife and people. Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

State of Alaska. 1959. Alaska State Constitution, Article 8, Section 4: Natural Resources. Juneau, Alaska, USA.

State of Alaska. 1961. Alaska game regulations, #2. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1964. Alaska game regulations, #5. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1971. Alaska game regulations, #12. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1994. Regulations of the Board of Game. Alaska Statute 16.05.255.E. Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1998*a*. Regulations of the Board of Game. Alaska Statute 16.05.255.G. Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

_____. 1998*b*. Alaska game regulations, #39. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.

State of California. 2005. California Statutes, Fish and Game Code, 4758-4760 and Section 120005. Sale and possession of bear parts and violation penalties. Sacramento, California, USA.

Stiles, D. 2004. The ivory trade and elephant conservation. Environmental Conservation 31:309-321.

Thorbjarnarson, J. 1999. Crocodile tears and skins: international trade, economic constraints, and limits to the sustainable use of crocodilians. Conservation Biology 13:465-470.

U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; designation the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears as a distinct population segment; removing the Yellowstone distinct population segment of grizzly bears from the federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife. Proposed rule. Federal Register, Volume 70, Number 221.

Williamson, D. F. 1999. A review of state bear trade laws: U.S. state statues and regulations regarding the American black bear (*Ursus americanus*). Traffic North America, Word Wildlife Fund, Washington, D.C., USA.

_____. 2002. In the black: status, management, and trade of the American black bear (*Ursus americanus*) in North America. Traffic North America, World Wildlife Fund, Washington D.C., USA.

Wright, T. F., C. A. Toft, E. Enkerlin-Hoeflich, J. Gonzalez-Elizondo, M. Albornoz, A. Rodríguez-Ferraro, F. Rojas-Suárez, V. Sanz, A. Trujillo, S. R. Beissinger, V. Berovides, X. Gálvez, A. T. Brice, K. Joyner, J. Eberhard, J. Gilardi, S. E. Koenig, S. Stoleson, P. Martuscelli, J. M. Meyers, K. Renton, A. M. Rodríguez, A. C. Sosa-Asanza, F. J. Vilella, and J. W. Wiley. 2001. Nest poaching in Neotropical parrots. Conservation Biology 15:710-720.

Yiming, L., G. Zhongwei, Y. Qisen, W. Yushan, and J. Niemelä. 2003. The implications of poaching for giant panda conservation. Biological Conservation 111:125-136.

Table 1. Summary of regulations regarding the sale of American black bear parts in the United States[1] and Canada[2]. Reproduced in part from Williamson (2002).

Bear part	Sale of parts taken in state is legal	Sale of parts taken in state is illegal	Sale is legal if legally taken in another jurisdiction	No law
Gallbladders	**5 States:** ID, ME, NV, VT, WY **2 Provinces[3]:** NS[4], NT	**35 States:** AL, AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, KY, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NC, OH, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI **9 Provinces:** AB, BC, MB, NB, NL, ON, QC, SK, YK	**6 States:** AR, CT, KS, LA, ND, OK	**4 States :** HI, IL, IA, IN **1 Province:** PEI
Paws	**7 States :** AZ, ID, MI, NH, NY, VT, WY **4 Provinces:** NS[4], NT, QC, SK	**32 States :** AL, AK, CA, CO, FL, GA, KY, MD, MA, ME, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NC, OH, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI **7 Provinces:** AB, BC[5], MB[5], NB, NL, ON, YK	**7 States :** AR, CT, DE, KS, LA, ND, OK	**4 States :** HI, IL, IA, IN **1 Province:** PEI
Claws and Teeth	**8 States :** AK[6], AZ, CO, ID, ME, MN, NM[7], NY, WY **6 Provinces:** BC, MB, NS[4], NT, QC, SK	**27 States :** AL, CA, FL, GA, KY, MD, MA, MI, MS, MO, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NC, OR, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WV, WI **5 Provinces :** AB[8], NB, NL, ON, YK	**11 States :** AR, CT, DE, KS, LA, ND, NV, OH[9], OK, PA, RI	**4 States :** HI, IL, IA, IN **1 Province :** PEI
Heads and Hides	**16 States :** AK[6,10], AZ, CO, ID, ME, MI, MN, MT, NH, NM, NY, UT, VT, WA, WV, WI[11], WY **11 Provinces:** AB, BC, MB, NB, NL[12], NS, NT, ON[13], QC, SK, YK	**19 States:** AL, CA, FL, GA, KY, MD, MA, MS, MO, NE, NC, NJ, OR, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA	**11 States:** AR, CT, DE, KS, LA, ND, NV, OH[9], OK, PA, RI	**4 States :** HI, IL, IA, IN **1 Province:** PEI

[1] Source: Williamson 1999
[2] Source: TRAFFIC 1996 survey of provincial and territorial wildlife authorities (as cited in Williamson 2002)
[3] Includes Canadian provinces and territories
[4] Parts except for hide may be sold only with full documentation of legal take
[5] Paws may be sold only if attached to hide
[6] Handicrafts made from skin, hide, pelt, fur or claws may be sold
[7] Claws only
[8] Claws may only be sold if attached to hide
[9] Sale of claws, teeth, hides, and hair legally acquired allowed
[10] Raw hides and skulls may be sold only from bears harvested within specified management areas
[11] Hide may be sold provided claws, head, and teeth are attached
[12] Sale of hide requires permit
[13] Skull, paws, claws, and teeth must be attached to skinned hide to be sold legally