

**From:** House Finance  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2017 5:31 PM  
**To:** Helen Phillips  
**Subject:** FW: HB90

Can you please distribute and post.

Thank you

Dear House Finance Committee Members.

Among the 43 categories of licensed professionals and occupations, the GUI category or Big Game Commercial Services Board is unique in significant ways. Legislators should at the least consider the uniqueness of the BGCSB and give thoughtful consideration to exempting the Big Game Commercial Services Board from this Bill.

It is common knowledge the Big Game Commercial Services Board has been operating in the red for years. While this Board may not be the only Board not collecting enough dollars in licensing fees to cover the cost of investigations what is unique about it's long history with an operating deficit is that for many years this Board refused request upon request by DCCED that this board move to increase it's licensing fees. And, despite DCCED's recent unilateral increase of this boards licensing fees the trend that this program will continue to have significant investigation costs makes it likely this group will continue to generate a substantial portion; like 20%, of the overall combined cost of investigations of the 43 groups represented.

The Guide licensing category ONLY includes hunting guides. In other words, this program does not include all other classes of guides engaged throughout Alaska as "guides". It does not include fishing, viewing, climbing, rafting, hiking, etc classes of guides. Literally thousands of other classes of guides could be licensed yet for some reason they are not. And, as far as I can tell regardless if a person sells private homes, property or commercial buildings all those involved in selling Realestate are licensed. It seems as if all classes of barbers and hair dressers are licensed and other professional and occupational licensees are captured under a licensing group as well. So clearly, there is potential for thousands of "guide" licensees to be added to the "guide" category. But, this bill does not address adding all classes of guides to come under this licensing category. But, I suppose it could be amended to do so?

Another unique attribute of the guide licensing program; aside from operating in the red, accounting for approximately 20% of the total investigative costs and only including a single class of guides out of all the different classes of guides in Alaska plying the trade, is that Law Enforcement is actually in the field and checking the conduct and compliance of people licensed as hunting guides. The State of Alaska has 70+ enforcement officers in the field spread throughout Alaska when guides are active. Law enforcement officers do not stop in and check licenses and compliance in a relator's office, or a chiropractors practice and are not dropping in on the operating room where nurses are practicing their professions.

Also unique to this program compared to the other 42 groups is out of the total 1,750 or so

licensed hunting guides it is likely less than 30 of those licensed actually make a full time living from "guiding". The remaining 1,700 or so licensed under this program commonly referred to as "hobby guides", spend no more than 2 to 5 weeks in the field annually. Many of them are not even residents of the State of Alaska. So unlike the 42 other groups nearly all licensed guides derive their annual incomes doing something besides 'guiding'.

Aside from this boards deficit in licensee fees, being a board that only licenses one class of guides, inducing a substantial amount of cost to the total cost of investigations, with State Law Enforcement actively checking guide compliance with related laws and regulations and being a licensed group that essentially represents as a seasonal occupation to include a high percentage of licensees who are not even residents of this state...this entire group is completely reliant on the viability and sustainability of taking public wildlife resources for it's profits. Not one of the other 42 categories of licensees depends on the taking of public resources for it's sustainability and profits.

Decreasing licensing fees for this unique category of licensees by nearly \$500,000.00 biannually through a scheme of shared burden such as has been proposed by HB90 likely makes this group too special to be included and considered under the terms and conditions of this bill in it's current state.

Respectfully,  
Mike McCrary