

Linda Hay

From: gullcove@ymail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 11:21 AM
To: linda Hay

House Resource Committee

Here is my comments on House Bill 158. For the long term benefit out of this wonderful renewable resource of our state, there isn't any other choice but to pass this bill. History shows there is two ways guiding is going to go in our State.

Keep DNR out of it other than issue land permits to all guides and let the Board of Game and the Federal Boards that regulate game on federal lands use the tools they are allowed to use. They have only a couple of tools.

A. Methods and Means

B. Seasons and Bag Limits

c. Elimination or major reduction of Non- Resident Hunting

These tools are like using a crescent wrench, versus a 150 tool socket set.

The end result will be Draw Permits, which affect all lands, 44 million acres of private, Federal Lands, and State Lands.

So the question is what would be best for our state and our residents that let us compete on a world wide market? ie: Most countries with big game have done guide areas.

So after a long hard reflection on which way would be best for the long term, the best return to our state and the young guide, the only answer is pass House Bill 158, and let DNR use the tools from their 150 tool socket set

This is not about the guides my age who have been Guiding 40 years, who have looked at other options, its about the young guides, long term return to the state, and the public. For our rural folks who have a future on private lands. If you don't pass this bill draw permits WILL happen a slow further demise of the guiding profession on all lands in our state will happen. Draw permits will leave the little guides in our state out, that is proven. Thanks for your time on this issue, please email me anytime with questions gull.cove@hotmail.com . My Best Paul Johnson

CC. Mia Costello

Sent from Windows Mail

Linda Hay

From: Sam Rohrer <sam@kodiakbearcamp.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 12:47 AM
To: Rep. Eric Feige; Rep. Dan Saddler; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Chris Tuck
Subject: Public Testimony for HB 158 Hearing 3/13/2013

House Resource Committee Members,

I was online to provide testimony in support of HB 158, however was not given an opportunity to speak. Please find below the text of what was intended to be my verbal testimony:

My name is Sam Rohrer, Registered Guide #1098, I am a Professional Member of APHA and Big Game Guiding accounts for approximately 60% of my income. I strongly encourage you to Support HB 158 and the development of a Guide Concession Program on State Lands.

I am a lifelong rural resident of Alaska and am a 2nd generation Hunting Guide. I am also the President of the Alaska Professional Hunters Association. APHA represents approximately 1/3rd of the Contracting Registered Guides in the State.

I believe the DNR GCP will benefit long term wildlife conservation, will benefit resident hunters (by reducing the number of guide operations in any given area), and will contribute to the long term sustainability of the Guiding Industry, which in turn brings important long term economic benefit to Alaska's small communities.

I would also like to point out that many have said that a Guide Concession program will eliminate opportunity for entrance into the Guiding Industry for young and up-and-coming guides. I will tell you that this is not the case. I successfully competed for a Federal Concession Area on Kodiak, which, by the way, is one of the most competitive areas in the state to "win" a federal concession in, and at the age of 21 I was successful in being awarded that Federal Area. All that to say, and as Lyle Becker very clearly articulated in his public testimony, if a young guide commits himself to the guiding industry, works hard, and keeps "their nose clean" they can be successful in being awarded an area in a Concession Program.

For these reasons I ask that you support HB 158.

Thank you for your time,

Sam Rohrer

Sams Alaskan Adventures

P.O. Box 1388

Kodiak, AK 99615

907-486-4074

907-539-1828

www.kodiakbearcamp.com

Linda Hay

From: Tim Booch <booch@ptialaska.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 8:19 AM
To: Tim Booch; Rep. Eric Feige
Cc: coke wallace; truewildernessadventures@yahoo.com; rep.dan.sadder@akleg.gov; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Chris Tuck; Rep. Alan Austerman; sam@kodiakbearcamp.com; thor Stacey
Subject: Re: APHA/DNR GUACP
Attachments: My name is Tim Booch dba Aleutian Islands Guide Service.doc

Members of the House Resources Standing Committee:

Greetings

Please allow me to retract my earlier correspondence and replace it with this. It was brought to my attention that a missing word had caused a grievous misunderstanding of my message.

I would like to again voice my opposition to the APHA,/DNR GUACP and HB 158. Although I did not submit my comments in opposition to the plan on the DNR public comment page of their web site during this last comment period. I did attend the public meeting in Anchorage last month and I had an hour and a half long meeting with Clark Cox and Christy, his assistant, in the DNR office in Anchorage later that week. I have attended a number of DNR public comment meetings and each time there has been a 70% to 80% opposition to this plan.

Please find attached to this memo my previous comments posted on the DNR web site. As you can see in the introductory paragraph of my comments I have been a contracting big game sport hunting guide since 1995 and I began my career as an apprentice assistant guide in 1988. I have been a professional member of the APHA (Alaska Professional Hunters Association) since 1996.

The first vestig of the GUACP was hatched during an annual APHA membership meeting in the late nineties when Bobby Fithian was hired as the Executive Director. The current DNR GUACP feels too much like crony capitalism that will support a minority voice in the guide industry, and will benefit those working hard to implement it.

The APHA has gone through great upheaval and internal strife in the last several years. Officers and Board of Directors have resigned, accusations were made against the Executive Director, his Executive Director position was eliminated, the organization lost their Simmon/Waugh tax exempt Charitable Trust status, and very prominent members left the APHA and have made efforts to form an alternative professional guide association. The membership of the APHA represents maybe 1/3rd of the contracting Registered Guides in the State, with many more stakeholders in this issue, including Class-A and Assistant Guides. The APHA has had several teleconferences for it's members, with

limited participation. There has never been a ballot vote of the members on this program to my knowledge. I believe some of the problems I outlined above prevented our organization from more thoroughly examining other options to the DNR GUACP plan.

Please read my comments on the APHA,/DNR GUACP that I have attached to this memo. It has been my desire to stay engaged in this issue by providing an alternative to this subjective and capricious program. It will not help to preserve this uniquely Alaskan sport hunting culture that we all share.

Your careful and thoughtful consideration of these comments will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely

Tim Booch

Aleutian Islands Guide Service

9074874984

Clark Cox
Natural Resource Manager
DNR

My name is Tim Booch dba Aleutian Islands Guide Service. I am a 31 year resident of Kodiak Island. I am a Master Guide/Outfitter and I conduct my guided trophy hunts in Game Management Unit (GMU) 8 (Kodiak), 9 (Alaska Peninsula), and 10, (Unimak and Adak Island in the Aleutian Islands). I am in possession of 2 "joint use" USF&WS Refuge Permits that allow me to conduct my trophy brown bear and Barren Ground caribou hunts in 2 separate Federal Refuge's in the Aleutian Islands. I have been awarded these permits since 1995. I conduct my Alaska Peninsula trophy brown bear and moose hunts from 2 separate DNR "seasonal recreation camp permit" (LAS) camps. I have used these camps since 1996. I conduct my Kodiak brown bear, Sitka blacktail deer, and Roosevelt elk hunts from State of Alaska "State Parks" permitted camps in the Afognak Island State Park.

I am opposed to the "Federal style" Prospectus and the Federal style bureaucratic "re-make" of a well established State of Alaska agency, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), whose stated mission is to "conserve and protect the Natural Resources of Alaska for all Alaskans and Future Alaskans". No where in their mission statement, or in the past history of the department, is there any hint of the notion that they could, should, or would manage the professional sport hunting industry in Alaska on state land.

USF&WS Refuge permits are awarded to applicants that have submitted a "Prospectus" and that have presented an "Operations Plan" that is compliant with the "Terms and Conditions" of that permit and that reflects the recognition of the applicant of the personal opinions and goals of the individual Refuge managers and their colleagues in the Federal Dept. of the Interior. The conservation goals expressed by the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the allocation of those State of Alaska Constitutionally mandated, "held in common" game animals, are only secondary in degrees of importance to the Fed's when compared to their "Federal" mandate. Competition for these permits is high due to the limiting of the number of guides awarded these permits and law suits challenging the subjectivity of the scoring criteria from unsuccessful applicants are a common denominator in the process. Each page of a "Federal" prospectus is a legal "affidavit" and ANY "false statement", such as mistakenly accounting for the number of days in the field over the previous twenty years, automatically "disqualifies" the applicant. Personal from the USF&WS, or the same Federal style bureaucrat permit specialist that will be employed with DNR, won't inform the applicant of the mistake and allow that individual to correct it, like the Big Game Commercial Services Board Occupational Licensing permit specialists will do if they find that a guide has left something out in a State "Hunt Record", but they will simply send the applicant a certified letter thanking him or her for participating in the process but denying him or her the permit. Even a successful USF&WS permit applicant must sign a "release" before the permit is awarded holding the Refuge "blameless" should the Refuge decide to "revoke" the permit for ANY reason ... not just "noncompliance". The only reason that I participate in the "Federal bureaucratic Prospectus" permitting process is that I love hunting in the Aleutian Islands and the best trophy big game sport hunting in the Aleutians is found on the Federal Refuges. That fact has more to do with the remote location of those Refuges rather than any act of allocation of the resources that these Federal agents might facilitate.

The Department of Natural Resources provides a number of different seasonal recreational permits that the various commercial services providers can apply for so that they can establish their presence on state land and build a business. The "Terms and Conditions" of these permits "convey" a certain amount of "implied ownership" during the specified time of the use of the permit. The "Terms and Conditions" applicable in a "DNR seasonal recreational camp permit" (LAS) mirror the terms and conditions of a USF&WS Refuge permit. One of the conditions to a DNR (LAS) permit, and a condition that is not included in the conditions of a Federal Refuge permit, is that the DNR (LAS) permit holder must take photo's before, during, and after the permitted use and these photo's must be sent to the DNR "Permit Specialist" to be checked for his or her "compliance" to the conditions of that permit. Non-compliance can result in the permit holder losing the permit. A major contributor to the overcrowding problem on state land is the guide with a DNR "14 day statewide "permit". Unlike the DNR recreational camp "leases" and seasonal recreational camp (LAS) permits, that establish the camps by providing a GPS, Latitude and Longitude, and Township and Range, the 14 day state wide permits DO NOT establish a camp site and a guide with this kind of permit CAN NOT prove where they have camped or be held accountable for their impact on the environment. When an application for a recreational camp lease or permit is submitted to DNR they are sent out along with an "invitation to comment" to ALL government agencies, registered guides, and interested parties in the GUA for which the permit will be applied. No comments from the public are solicited from DNR for the approval of an application for a 14 day state wide permit.

The "Board of Game" (BOG) has been tasked for many years with regulating the access and allocation of the big game sport hunting and trapping species in the state of Alaska. The public's input is incorporated in the BOG proposal process and together with all of the shareholder voices in this shared culture the future of big game sport hunting in Alaska is determined by the adoption or denial of those proposals. Bag limits are set and allocation guidelines are established in regulation that will reflect the conservation goals of the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the State of Alaska statutes pertaining to the commercial big game sport hunting industry, and the resident sport hunting and subsistence community. The most effective "tool" in the conservation and allocation "tool box" is the well established and precedent setting "limited drawing permit" allocation system manifest in the Kodiak brown bear drawing permit allocation guidelines. These fair, equitable, and logical allocation guidelines have effectively and positively addressed every problem that is inherent when too many "consumers" are in competition for too few resources. The BOG has in the past and will continue to implement in the future a limited drawing permit allocation when ever and where ever the competition between guides and residents reaches critical mass regardless if the APHA DNR/ GUACP is implemented or not. The latest assault on the Alaska big game sport hunting guide industry comes from the BOG's recent precedent setting Delta, Alaska Dall's sheep drawing permit regulation that sets the nonresident allocation of permits at "up to 10 %". If this and the TOK nonresident sheep allocation are left to stand then the death of the big game sport hunting guide industry in Alaska is set in stone.

Guides are already limited by established "ethics standards" not only in the BGCSB and BOG statutes and regulations but also by the Boone and Crockett and Pope and Young "fair chase" sport hunting ethics that have been the standard for achieving the high "quality of the hunting experience" in Alaska, that for the most part, as been the case for the last quarter century. This current attempt to "federalize" the guide industry on state

land is not a result of any "subsistence" issues, although there are a few "special interest" groups that would like to make it so, but it has everything to do with a few selfish and unethical residents, non-guided nonresidents, and big game guides and transporters competing for a harvestable surplus of the past their breeding prime, "guide required for non-residents", trophy big game animals.

It is my understanding that the previous "Guide Board" was "sunsetting" at the same time that the "sole use guide use areas" on state land were done away with as a result of the "Owsichuk Decision". The Big Game Commercial Service Board (BGCSB, the re-born Guide Board) was reestablished six or seven years ago to help bring the growing commercial big game sport hunting industry into the 21st century Alaska trophy big game sport hunting culture and to help police the industry. As a result of the aggressive lobbying of the State Legislature, the BGCSB, and the BOG, by a few individuals representing their "special interests" in the Alaska big game guide industry, the APHA (Alaska Professional Hunters Association)/DNR "Guide Use Area Concession Plan" (GUACP), that is designed to eliminate the competition for the authors of the plan, has put a "shackle" on the BOG and the BGCSB and has distracted them and kept them from performing their fiduciary and legal obligation to the industry and the public. It has kept them from adopting regulations that would effectively remedy the problems identified when and where they exist and to apply these remedies fairly to all the shareholders and without exempting the residents that have created a major portion of the problem in the first place.

The following regulation adopted recently by the BGCSB has set a precedent in the state.

ARTICLE 3,

12 AAC 75.340 PROFESSIONAL ETHICS STANDARDS FOR GUIDES.

(d) Field craft standards.

(7) ... " allow appropriate buffer areas between hunters and camps in order to avoid disrupting hunts and hunting experiences: in GMU 9, a person holding any class of guide license may not place a camp within two (2) miles of a permanent structure or permanent camp being used for big game guiding purposes, unless agreed upon by in a written agreement between the involved parties;

The authors of the wording of this regulation are the same individuals that created the APHA/DNR GUACP. Instead of allowing the BGCSB to use the terms "permanent structure or permanent camp" to legitimize these special interest motivated claims that these are the only established big game sport hunting guide operations on state land in GMU 9 we must DEMAND that the BGCSB rewrite this regulation with the terms " ... ? miles of a "DNR permitted recreational camp lease or seasonal recreational camp permit (LAS) camp" ... and adjust the miles appropriately for each GUA and start IMMEDIATELY implementing this regulation state wide. DNR should also do away with the "14 day state wide permit". I believe that it can be proven that there are many established DNR camps state wide already providing those guides an established base of operations that does not conflict with their neighbors at this time and has not in the past. I believe that any guides with DNR 14 day state wide permits wanting to establish their presence in an area can still go to the DNR and identify the existing camp permits

in the area and submit an application for a camp permit that doesn't infringe on the quality of the hunting experience for anybody. The BGCSB could include the big game sport hunting "Transporters" in this regulation and DNR could require Transporters to apply for and establish recreational camps as well. The BGCSB has adopted regulations dealing with "unlawful acts and ethics standards" that when violated by a guide can result in a fine and "disciplinary actions taken" by the Board. The State Troopers are tasked with enforcing guide regulations as well and they have the ability to write tickets so that the State Judicial Court System can exact fines and appropriate punishment.

According to the Owsichuk Decision ... "the common clause in the Alaska State Constitution makes no distinction between use for personal purposes and use for professional purposes". If we would allow ourselves to recognize that trophy big game sport hunting in Alaska is a "privilege" and not a "right" then we can begin to "call out" the few selfish and unethical individuals that are responsible for a majority of the problem and that pay the least for their consumption of and impact on the resources. We must DEMAND the State to properly fund Occupational Licensing enforcement and the Troopers and hold these agencies accountable for their lack of enforcement of the laws, statutes, and regulations. We guides must DEMAND that the resident sport hunters be held to the same ethic standards and regulations that the commercial service providers are required to obey. We guides must also DEMAND that the residents be ticketed, prosecuted and fined for violating those regulations.

A person doesn't need to be a "Profit" to see that where ever in the state that multiple guides and residents compete for "past their breeding prime, guide required for nonresidents, trophy big game sport hunting allocated species such as brown bear, grizzly, sheep, Mt goat, and moose? (Koyukuk) the BOG WILL implement a limited drawing permit allocation. I also believe that it is obvious that the "The Kodiak Model" drawing permit allocation guidelines ... along with the established BOG policy of determining the allocation in a drawing by looking at the "previous 10 year percentage average of resident versus nonresident " ... will sooner than later be implemented in ALL new and existing drawing permit hunts. If we can see the obvious benefit that the existing DNR permit process has brought and can continue to bring to the guide industry, as long as their mission and focus is not blurred by being forced to manage the big game guide industry on state land and as long as the BOG and BGCSB are held accountable, then it isn't hard to see that there should be and can be DNR permitted "resident" camps that are "designated" and associated with the drawing permits allocated to residents.

Please help the BOG and the BGCSB board members regain the prestige and focus that the Governor intended for them to have when he appointed them to these vitally important regulatory Boards by accepting and performing the equally important duties that you were originally designed and tasked to do. Please give the Alaska big game sport hunting industry and the rest of the Alaska big game sport hunting community as well the chance to rise to the highest calling and come together in the spirit of solidarity to enhance and protect the awesome hunting culture that we can all enjoy now and hopefully continue to enjoy in the future.

Sincerely

Tim Booch

MAR 13 2013

Dear Representative Feige,

My name is Mark Binggeli. I am an assistant guide, and have been a resident and hunting in Alaska for nearly 25 years. **I oppose of the GCP.** It will cost the state and hurt the majority of guides. It is an initiative supported by only the 125 members of the APHA and does not properly represent me or the guides I work with. The animals and many of the other thousand guides & assistant guides will be hurt by the GCP.

There has not been a vote of all registered guide about the GCP. If there was a vote, the majority of guide and assistant guide would not support this. This exclusive guide area only benefits the large guide operations with lodges and large client lists and a larger more damaging foot print on the resource. The limits to small guide businesses or limited guide use areas are at the mercy of the large operations with rights of refusal. This will kill the smaller operations and result in less revenue to the industry and the state. **The reasons to bring this about are not based on facts** only the opinions of a few. The APHA claims that the way things use to be is better is not factual. The claims that excessive guides are over harvesting a certain area are also false. The board of game can manage this if it is a problem. At the recent public meeting in Anchorage, only 3 guides (APHA members) supported the GCP while all of the other guides who spoke opposed it.

It is fiscally irresponsible to enact the GCP. It should not be funded. In the end, there will be less guides and this will reduce revenue to the state. The outlined fees per client will force large operations to have to kill more animals in the most economical way which in the end hurts the resource. All this program does is take business from one guide and give to another guide, it will not help the resource at all. In the end the state, the animals, and the small businesses lose.

Chairman of the BOG Cliff Judkins stated in his public comment, quote " **Both times DNR has proposed this program it appears to have been not well received by the industry and the public.....**" It is important to recognize that large regions of this state do not have any identified conflict or conservation concerns related to the guiding industry. " I urge anyone that is opposed to the GCP to support House Bill 8 which would stop this program

Sincerely,



Mark Binggeli

907-355-2965

mrkovis@yahoo.com

PO Box 871337
Wasilla 99487

Linda Hay

From: Alaska Backcountry Hunters & Anglers <kandik@starband.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 1:14 PM
To: linda_hay@legis.state.ak.us; trevor_fulton@legis.state.ak.us
Subject: HB 158 - Comments I think the committee needs to see

Dear Linda and Trevor,

Can you get this to the rest of the House Resources Committee please before the final hearing and comments tomorrow? Thank you very much, comments below.

Dear House Resources Committee,

This is Mark Richards writing, co-chair of Alaska Backcountry Hunters & Anglers. Am writing in re HB 158, concerning the Guide Concession Program (GCP) and DNR authority to implement and oversee that program.

This is an issue we have been following since its inception, and have commented many times at various public meetings and hearings, as well as by letter. We still continue to **OPPOSE** the GCP as it now stands, and DNR authority to implement and oversee it.

But rather than restate the rationale of our opposition in full, I wanted to focus on the fiscal aspects of HB 158 and the GCP under DNR's wing, and how it relates to ongoing and huge fiscal problems with the Big Game Commercial Services Board (BGCSB), which oversees the guide industry.

I hope you are all aware that the BGCSB is currently \$600,000 in the red, and is forecast to be \$800,000 in debt by FY 2014. This is a board under the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development (DCCED), and by law this board is supposed to fund itself through licensing (and other) fees. This ongoing lack of ability for the BGCSB to fund itself, and going evermore in debt, has many causes, not the least of which is that guide license fee increases have been completely taken off the table. For a review of draft minutes from the last BGCSB meeting, and more information that should shock all of you, please see this link:

http://www.dced.state.ak.us/occ/pub/GUI_Meeting_Minutes_2012_12_DRAFT.pdf

This issue of the BGCSB's lack of funding came up in the last legislative session, and the implication was that unless this board could fund itself it would be in real danger of being sunsetted.

Move on now to the GCP, which under DNR's estimates is going to require 1.4 million dollars annually to fund. There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that some guides, should the GCP be implemented, will be put out of business. Which means they will likely not renew their guide licenses, further reducing funding to the BGCSB. **We believe that if the GCP is ever implemented, it cannot exist and work without us also having a BGCSB to oversee the guide industry. Further, we see no way the BGCSB can continue to exist under the current way it is being run fiscally.**

Right now the public is essentially paying to fund guide industry oversight and objectives that the guide industry should be paying for. Already too, DNR has spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars on this GCP that we will never see back. We don't believe that the GCP can be fully funded either under the current DNR plan.

So if we look only to the fiscal issues surrounding this, we believe it is clear that the state (and public) will continue to be on the hook for something the guide industry should be paying for.

The simplest solution to the issues presented as to why we need a GCP, the overcrowding, unlimited number of guides

allowed on state lands, biological harm to wildlife populations, has always been for the Board of Game to limit nonresident opportunities in problem areas. There is no major costs to the state in doing this, **nor any legal challenges that could cost the state more money**. And if the whole intent of the GCP is actually to reduce the number of guides and their assistants in the problem areas, in order to reduce nonresident opportunity in those same areas, it would be a wash as to what monies come into F&G with such reduced nonresident opportunities and reductions in non-resident license and harvest tag fees. This whole notion we can't reduce nonresident opportunity because it would cause reductions in monies coming to F&G and the state is absurd on it's face, when the entire premise of the GCP is to do exactly that, on a scale that looks at each area as to problems...the BOG can do exactly the same thing.

We urge this committee to fully consider these issues and come to the recognition that the GCP can't pay for itself, needs to coexist with a BGCSB (that also can't pay for itself), and that there is a far simpler and much less costly way of dealing with the problems we have that surround this issue.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Mark Richards

co-Chair AK BHA

alaskabha@starband.net

Linda Hay

From: Sam Rohrer <sam@kodiakbearcamp.com> on behalf of rrohrer@alaska.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2013 12:18 PM
To: Rep. Eric Feige; Rep. Dan Saddler; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Chris Tuck
Cc: Sen. Gary Stevens; Rep. Alan Austerman
Subject: HB 158

Dear House Resources Committee Members,

I encourage you to support House Bill 158 and clarify that DNR does have the authority to implement a Big Game Guide Concession Program. My introduction to the Guide Industry began in 1965 and continues to this day. I'm still actively guiding at the age of 69 and have just been selected to provide guiding services on Federal Land for the next 10 years beginning Spring 2014. Since I'll be 80 years old at the end of this permit period its very unlikely that I'll ever be competing for another guide offering on Federal or State Land. Thus I have nothing to gain personally by this action.

However after all these years of involvement in the guiding industry including the last 20 operating under a Federal Guide Concession Program it is my opinion that the best action for the future of Big Game Guiding on State land is to implement a selection program similar to that used by the US Fish & Wildlife Service. Since the BGCSB doesn't have Statutory authority to implement such it is clear to me that the DNR is the agency best suited to do so.

I've been an APHA member for over 30 years and just completed serving two terms on the Big Game Commercial Services Board. At every BGCSB meeting during the past seven years there has been discussion about the development of a guide concession program on State Land. These meetings have been well attended mostly by Licensed Guides but also by the public with several opportunities at each meeting for public testimony. The testimony at these meetings has been in large majority supportive of a Concession Program on State Land. I believe there were 50-60 or even more in attendance at a BGCSB three day meeting in Fairbanks that dealt with mapping of the current DNR Guide Use areas.

Please support HB 158.

Regards, Richard Rohrer MG License #69

Rohrer Bear Camp Inc.

Kodiak, AK 99615

907-539-5800

rrohrer@alaska.com



Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Resources Committee
Committee name

Committee on HB 158 dated 3/13/13
Bill/Subject

SIRS,

I am in opposition to the proposed program due to the heavy financial burden placed on guides in an already difficult business climate.

This amounts to a tax placed on operators in a contracting economic situation. It also places a governmental agency to pick winners and losers in a business, rather than the free enterprise system. 100% of my families income is from Guiding. Our tourism industry is shrinking enough.

Signed:

Wayne Woods AK Master Guide # 108
Testifier

Representing (Optional)

PO Box 3037 Palmer, AK 99645
Address

907-354-1294
Phone number

Linda Hay

From: Joey Klutsch <joeyklutsch@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 9:02 PM
To: 'Rep.Eric.Feige@akleg.gov'; Rep. Dan Saddler; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Chris Tuck
Subject: HB 158

House Resource Committee Members,

My name is Joey Klutsch and I am a second generation Registered Guide (RG 1277) and rural Alaska resident living in King Salmon. Guiding is my sole source of income and full time profession. I am also an active subsistence user and member of APHA. I am writing because I strongly support, and encourage you to support, HB 158.

It is essential that the DNR Guide Concession Program be implemented on state lands not only for the guiding profession, but for all user groups. I would like to emphasize that the DNR GCP will not eliminate any opportunity for resident hunters. Resident opportunity will only improve. Having fewer guides in a given area will reduce conflicts in the field with resident hunters and subsistence users. It will also lead to a better quality of experience for guided hunters.

In addition to alleviating in the field conflicts, the DNR Guide Concession Program will benefit the resource, which is by far the most important factor to consider. In too many areas on state land, overuse of the resource by an unlimited number of guides has resulted in stressed game populations. The DNR Guide Concession Program will go a long way toward solving this issue. We need only look at the Federal areas (FWS, NPS) of the State where guide concession programs are already in place to see how effective such programs are at solving all the problems which the DNR GCP is addressing.

Finally, the program will not make it impossible for new entrance into the guiding business by younger guides. It does not favor the "good old boy" generation of guides, as many people claim. It is just not the case. As a 27 year old Registered Guide I was able to successfully compete for and be awarded 2 National Wildlife Refuge Areas last year. I know other young guides who had similar successes. The process for being awarded these areas is highly competitive. To me, this is proof positive that if you are a young guide who is committed to the profession you will stand a great chance at being awarded a DNR Guide Concession Permit.

Thank you for your consideration and time. At stake is nothing less than the sustainable future of guiding and the health of all Alaskans wildlife resource.

--

Joey Klutsch
Registered Guide 1277
Katmai Guide Service

PO Box 222
King Salmon, AK 99613
(907) 439-3030

Linda Hay

From: Kurt Whitehead <kurtjw99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Rep. Bryce Edgmon; Rep. Lynn Gattis; Rep. Bob Herron; Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. Charisse Millett; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Chris Tuck; Rep. Max Gruenberg; Rep. Pete Higgins; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Beth Kerttula; Rep. Cathy Munoz; Rep. Lance Pruitt; Rep. Bill Stoltze; Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Neal Foster; Rep. Lindsey Holmes; Rep. Andy Josephson; Rep. Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins; Rep. Gabrielle LeDoux; Rep. Benjamin Nageak; Rep. Lora Reinbold; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. Harriet Drummond; Rep. Mike Hawker; Rep. Bob Lynn; Rep. Dan Saddler; Rep. Doug Isaacson; Rep. Alan Austerman; Rep. Eric Feige; Rep. Tammie Wilson; Rep. Steve Thompson; Rep. Scott Kawasaki; Rep. Scott Kawasaki; Rep. David Guttenberg; Rep. Mia Costello; Rep. Mike Chenault; Rep. Les Gara
Subject: Please Support House Bill 158

Dear Alaskan Legislator,

I am writing today to urge you to pass House Bill 158.

I am a registered hunting and fishing guide in Southeast Alaska and DO NOT operate on State Lands because it is such a MESS.

The first year I became a registered guide in 2001, I conducted 3 hunts on State Lands in GMU 19 and saw what a cutthroat, screwed up, convoluted, air war the hunting had become on these wonderful lands. I had guided for an hunting operator the year before in an adjacent area and saw how he was forced to operate because of all the competition and choose to move away from his area thinking it would be better. It was no different. Three tents from 3 different guides were camped on the same airstrip two days in advance of the opener all trying to hunt the same sheep. I finally found a strip that wasn't occupied only to have yet another guide walk in and camp within 100 yards of our tent.

Ridiculous is the best way to describe the hunting on state lands in Alaska. It is not just during sheep season either.

This is not what our non-resident and resident hunters need to see or participate in when they hunt in Alaska.

Canada has exclusive guide use areas and the average guided sheep hunt retails at about \$20,000. In Alaska, the same sheep hunt retails at around \$10,000 due to the overhunting, crowding and conflicts in the field.

You have the opportunity to fix a very real problem in this state that many guides, non-resident and resident hunters, board of game members, biologists and concerned citizens have been dealing with for many years and of which the vast majority support.

The ones opposed are very likely the operators on State Lands that are the problem and would likely disappear or at the least, have to compete for an area.

This selection process of choosing the top 2-4 guides to share a guide use area is a good thing. This is how most of us guides that operate on federal lands are regulated and it promotes and benefits:

- Resident Hunters by reducing the number of Guided operations in any given area
- Long term wildlife conservation
- Members of the Board of Game because they won't have to deal with the trickle down issues of overcrowding and conflicts
- Guides because it introduces much needed long term stability of the Big Game Industry
- Non-resident hunters by having a quality hunt

-Hundreds of jobs in small communities, including guides, packers, pilots, boat captains, cooks, expeditors, taxidermists, airlines, etc.

This is the right choice for Wildlife Conservation, Resident Hunters, Non-Resident Hunters, Guides and the People of Alaska.

I urge you to support House Bill 158.

Sincerely,

Kurt Whitehead

ALASKA GLACIER ADVENTURES

www.AlaskaGlacierAdventures.com

www.AlaskaFishingOutfitter.com

www.AlaskaHuntingFishingReports.com

Alaska Glacier Adventures on Facebook

Kurt@AlaskaGlacierAdventures.com

Kurt Whitehead

Trina Nation

P.O. Box 388

Klawock, AK 99925

(907) 738-5000 Kurt

(907) 738-5700 Trina