

HB 137 Testimony as of February 20, 2020

Index

1. Paul Johnson
2. Nathan Shepard
3. Matthew Carr
4. Jay H. Stanford
5. Kevin Schwinkendorf
6. Rodney Pangborn
7. Dan Huttunen
8. Tia Shoemaker
9. Luke Tyrrell
10. Steven H. Perrins II (two submittals)
11. Aaron & Angie Bloomquist
12. Bruce & Ann-Marie Parker
13. Chet Benson
14. Joey Klutsch (two submittals)
15. Paul & Donna Claus
16. Jeff Burwell
17. Lance Kronberger
18. Nikki Kronberger
19. Lance Kronberger
20. Veronica Brost
21. Dennis M. Zadra
22. Edward Toribio
23. Henry D. Tiffany IV

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Rep. Sara Hannan
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 6:04 PM
To: Thatcher Brouwer; House Resources
Subject: FW: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Paul Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Rep. Sara Hannan <Rep.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov>
Subject: Fwd: HB 137

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Paul Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 4:10 PM
To: Representative.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov
Subject: HB 137

Representative Hannah,

My name is Paul Johnson and was born in the territory of Alaska. I have lived my life in Southeast Alaska doing the best I can to make a living from guiding and fishing I have grave concerns for House Bill 137 which I'd like to bring forward to you and hopefully you will pass copies of this email to the other members of resource committee. Getting non-residents in our beautiful state has brought great joy to my family and myself. I'm just a Southeast Alaska country boy who wears extra tough's but I do know the difference between may and shall. In this instance was House Bill 137 it would take apart a puzzle who that's been carefully put together by the board since statehood. To give an example in Southeast Alaska we put together management plans that was a consensus of many people. These plans that have included people from all aspects of use in Alaska And took many years to reach a consensus.

The guiding industry has been proud to have supported and work towards a sustainable harvest of Big game in our state we were the first and only industry who stepped forward two years ago to asked our fees to be increased to support proper Game management in our state. I could go on and on with several other items but it's important to know not to take this bill casually and please learn all aspects of the harm this bill would cause throughout our state to those of us who have been around a long time looking forward to hearing from you either by email or phone of 209-5149 my apologies not being able to make the hearing I best Paul Johnson

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Elle Ahkivgak

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 4:26 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Co-Chair Tarr, Co-Chair Lincoln, and members of the House Resources Committee,

As a 10 year resident of Alaska and a person who hunts and fishes as a means to provide my family with healthy, wild harvested meat and fish, I respectfully ask for your support of Senate Bill 137. This bill changes just a single word in the current statute. This small change will provide that those resources will not be harvested by nonresidents in times when the resources are limited. Ensuring that resident Alaskans have priority seems commonsense and SB137 addresses this commonsense thinking.

Please put this in your document packet for [next Wednesday's](#) hearing as a letter of support. Thank you for your time and consideration from myself as well as all my fellow Alaskans.

Sincerely,

Nathan Shepard

Sent from my iPhone

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Matthew Carr [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 3:21 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I support HB 137! Resident Alaskans first!

Sent from my iPhone

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Jay H. Stanford [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 8:36 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137 Opposition

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Representatives,

My name is Jay Stanford and I am writing to you today to express my concerns over HB 137 and letting you know that I strongly oppose it. I have been a life long Alaskan (29yrs) and have been able to experience many benefits this great state has to offer. I have been fortunate enough to make my living from some of the natural resources Alaska has to offer. In the summer I run a commercial salmon fishing operation in Bristol Bay, that has been in my family for three generations. In the spring and fall I spend my time doing what I really love, and that's guiding. I've been a hunting guide since 2013 and it has taken me all over the Wrangell Mountains, Alaska Peninsula, and Kodiak Island. I first got the idea of wanting to become a hunting guide from stories my grandpa would tell me when I was a kid. The guiding industry is what brought him to Alaska following the end of World War II and is how he made a living for a large portion of his life.

In the winters I spend part of my time attending hunting conventions in the lower 48, for one of the outfitters I guide for, to attract prospective clients to come hunt with us. These individuals, most of which are nonresidents, have a significant economic impact for the outfitter and the state. The money paid to the outfitter for a hunt isn't just kept by one person, it trickles down to pay guides, packers, cooks, pilots, grocery stores, sporting good stores, and the list goes on. If HB 137 goes through there could be significant hit to the guiding community and risk over 1000 jobs and a loss \$25-\$30 million in the states economy each year.

Besides the money to outfitters, nonresident hunters spend their money on airfare, hotels, restaurants, in local stores, and on licenses and tags. Even though these nonresident hunters make up a very small portion of the actual hunters in the field, the money from their license and tag fees make up over 70% of ADF&G revenue. A loss that could be \$5-\$25 million annually.

The Board of Game already has tools set in place to make sure resident hunting opportunity is met through limited nonresident seasons, limited methods and means, selective closures of nonresident hunts, and controlled use areas. If HB 137 goes through the Board of Game would have to go through and determine what is reasonable resident hunting opportunity in every area which is impossible to define. Speaking for myself, as someone who qualifies as a "resident hunter," I feel that I already have leaps and bounds of an advantage when it comes to hunting in Alaska compared to nonresidents.

In conclusion, I thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns over HB 137 and how I feel that it will have a negative impact on the State of Alaska and the guiding industry. The guiding industry in Alaska has some rich history and is one that needs to be protect. I hope that one day I can tell my grandkids about my guiding stories and inspire them to follow in my footsteps and that they will have the same opportunity as I have had.

Sincerely,

Jay H. Stanford
Registered Guide 117647
Alaska Resident

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Kevin Schwinkendorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 8:25 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Alaska Representative,

I am writing to express my opposition to HB 137, which is proposed to establish drawing limits for non-resident hunting in Alaska. Notice of this proposed bill was forwarded to me by the outfitter I have recently booked with for a moose hunt in the Wrangell Mountain/St. Elias area, for late September 2022. I have already paid my outfitter a \$5,000 deposit to secure the hunt, with a balance due of \$20,000 by May 2022. I have NO intention of risking my hunt to the uncertainties of a limited draw situation. As far as I am concerned, I am going on this hunt, or somebody is going to get sued. This is going to be my "dream hunt" that I have wanted to do for most of my life (like 40 years). Non-resident hunters pay high dollar fees to provide a living for guides and outfitters, not to mention non-resident hunting licenses and tag fees.

I am also planning on traveling to Alaska along the Alaska Marine Highway System (seagoing ferries) to add a cruise to my vacation, which will also give me the opportunity to travel to Alaska with my own truck, so that I can drive to various other places (Anchorage, Fairbanks, etc.) that I have always wanted to see (I will meet my outfitter in Fairbanks where we will fly to the remote airstrip where we will pack in 20 miles to his area on horseback). Just the ferry passage alone will cost a few thousand dollars, which will also add to the Alaskan economy.

The area we will hunt is remote and I doubt very much that any resident hunter will be impacted (at all) by any game I take in this remote area. In addition, I am sure there are many other solutions to the concern of meeting resident hunting needs (e.g., customizing non-resident seasons and areas to be hunted).

Thank you for understanding my position on this legislation.

Kevin N. Schwinkendorf
Richland, WA

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Rodney Pangborn [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 8:14 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137--VOTE NO

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing this letter in opposition of HB 137 that will be heard on Wednesday February 19th.

The one word change of this bill has extreme far reaching negative effects that far outway resident hunters sharing "hunting opportunity" with non residents.

ADF&G has submitted an estimated cost for implementation of HB 137 to the amount of \$5-25 million dollars. The bill would mandate an unrecoverable amount of money, to an unnecessary review of every single hunt in the state to ensure "reasonable resident hunting opportunity". This is a completely ambiguous term that opens a whole new set of challenges of who decides what is reasonable.

This bill implementation would cause extreme harm to resident hunters due to the loss of funds to operate the ADF&G system that is paid for primarily by non resident hunter dollars.

The huge loss of non resident license and tag fee income for the state of Alaska would be unrecoverable and detrimental to the already underfunded ADF&G.

The Board of Game already has adequate tools to ensure resident hunting opportunity is met: Limiting non-resident season dates, non resident antler restrictions, limit methods and means of hunting, closures of hunts to non-residents.

I have been an Alaskan Resident for 15 years and personally hire 20 other resident Alaskans to guide non resident hunters & fishermen in the state of Alaska. This bill would/could directly negatively impact all of these families' income-- that we all depend on.

My guides and I personally conduct yearly animal surveys to ensure an adequate amount of quality game is in the areas we guide in and share with resident hunters.

This bill seeks to appease a select few resident hunters in Alaska that don't want non resident hunters in "their state".

I ask that you please vote NO on HB 137. HB 137 does NOT have Alaskan's best interests in mind. Please vote for all Alaskan's benefit and not a select few.

Rodney Pangborn
North Pole, AK 99705
[REDACTED]

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Dan Huttunen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 8:19 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: My Testimony re: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please include my testimony as follows into the record re: HB 137.

February 16, 2020

To: House Finance Committee

RE: HB 137 - Limit Nonresident Taking of Big Game

Dear Co-Chair Tarr, Co-Chair Lincoln, and House Finance Committee Members:

In the strongest possible terms, I encourage you to pass HB 137 out of Committee. As you may or may not be aware, certain resident hunting opportunities have gradually eroded in recent years and those lost opportunities have very quietly been transferred to nonresidents. The justification offered by the Alaska Board of Game is that in certain cases nonresident-generated commerce trumps resident hunting preference. Certainly guiding activities generate significant revenues to individual guides and to the State.

Of course the assumption is that all guides are Alaskan residents and those revenues are all coming into Alaska. That is not true. There is **NO** requirement for a licensed (hunting or fishing) guide to be an Alaskan resident and many are not. In those cases, the nonresident guides come to Alaska, their nonresident clients leave with their Alaskan trophies, and the guides leave with their clients' money.

In some cases where there is a larger resident demand than a wildlife population can sustain, a significant portion of the harvest opportunities are offered **exclusively** to nonresidents. In others, residents must compete on an equal footing with nonresidents - even in those hunts most severely restricted and most desired by Alaska residents.

As you know, Alaska is an owner state and the framers unambiguously intended that the natural resources of the state be managed for the benefit of the **[Alaskan]** people. If the Board of Game adhered to that intent, there would be no need for your consideration of this legislation.

Again, as a 66-year Alaskan resident whose family relies heavily upon our fish and wildlife resources for sustenance, I implore you to support this bill and pass it out of committee without delay.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Respectfully,

Dan Huttunen
Wasilla

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Tia Shoemaker [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 8:36 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: Opposing House Bill 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Alaskan Representatives,

I am writing to voice my opposition to House Bill 137.

As a Registered Guide the repercussions of HB 137 will be devastating to my livelihood, my passion, and the financial well-being of my family. Limiting availability of hunting opportunity to non-residents by instituting a draw will put many Outfitters and Alaskan families out of business and only cause animosity and increase resource conflict between user groups.

As a lifelong Alaskan resident, subsistence user, and conservationist, the economic and cultural impacts of the bill appear detrimental to all Alaskans. The financial impact alone would be substantial to an already struggling Alaskan economy. It has the potential to limit job opportunities and business in rural Alaska which thrive on nonresident hunting dollars. Furthermore, the reduction of Pitman-Robertson allocated dollars would have a dire impact on our ability to responsibly manage Big Game species for all hunters.

Alaska has been iconic for adventurers and hunters since long before statehood, and we have learned to responsibly market this resource to nonresidents over the past decades. We need to focus on the importance of marketing renewable resources to fuel Alaska's economy.

Additionally, limiting nonresident hunting via a draw system to endure "reasonable resident opportunity" seems an impossible and cumbersome task. Who is responsible for the financial and legal burdens of defining and determining such a threshold? Are there not ways to address this issue with less ambiguity? It appears that this bill will serve only to increase animosity and open pathways to further limit opportunities for nonresidents and guides.

I was born and raised in Alaska and have grown up in the guiding industry. Guiding serves as a primary income for myself and my family, as well as the families of the multiple Alaska residents who guide for us. I'm only one example of the many families across Alaska who have chosen to make a career out of sharing our resources and providing hunting opportunities for nonresidents in Alaska.

Is our livelihood and the accompanying conservation dollars' worth less than a resident hunter who feels they aren't getting a chance to take a shot at the biggest trophies in Alaska?

Tia Shoemaker

Grizzly Skins of Alaska

[REDACTED]

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Luke Tyrrell [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 9:08 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: A voice in opposition of HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

For Alaskas Representatives,

I am writing to voice my opposition to House Bill 137.

As a full-time Registered Guide/Outfitter, the repercussions of HB 137 will be devastating to my livelihood, my passion, and the financial well being of my family and employees. Limiting availability of hunting opportunity to non-residents by instituting a draw will put many Outfitters and Alaskan families out of business and only cause animosity and increase resource conflict between user groups.

As a lifelong Alaskan resident, subsistence user, and conservationist, the economic and cultural impacts of the bill appear detrimental to all Alaskans. The financial impact alone would be substantial to an already struggling Alaskan economy, further reducing the funds available to properly manage Big Game resources across Alaska, as well as limiting job opportunities and businesses in Rural Alaska which thrive on nonresident hunting dollars. Alaska has been iconic for adventurers and hunters since long before statehood, and we have learned to responsibly market this resource to nonresidents over the past decades. Now more than ever we need to focus on the importance of marketing renewable resources to fuel Alaskas economy.

Additionally, limiting nonresident hunting via a draw system to endure "reasonable resident opportunity" seems an impossible and cumbersome task. Who is responsible for the financial and legal burdens of defining and determining such a threshold? Are there not ways to address this issue with less ambiguity? It appears that this bill will serve only to increase animosity and open pathways to further limit opportunities for nonresidents and guides.

I was born and raised in Alaska, and have made guiding and outfitting in Alaska my career for the past 15 years. My outfit serves as a primary income for my family, as well as the families of the multiple Alaska residents who guide for me. I'm only one example of the many families across Alaska who have chosen to make a career out of sharing our resources and providing hunting opportunities for nonresidents in Alaska.

Is our livelihood worth less than a resident hunter who feels they aren't getting a chance to take a shot at the biggest trophies in Alaska?

Luke Tyrrell

Tyrrell's Trails
www.tyrrellstrails.com
[REDACTED]

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Steven H. Perrins II [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 7:19 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: FW: HB 137 - OPPOSE - Very Important!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi there,

I am forwarding this email that I sent to all members of the House Resources committee so that it will be added to the record. This is a serious threat to an entire industry in Alaska as well as the conservation of our wildlife. Thank you for your time and service and for fully looking into the situation at hand to see what is really at risk.

Best wishes,

Steve H. Perrins II
Rainy Pass Lodge – Operations Manager
www.theperrinsrainypasslodge.com

[REDACTED]
Anchorage, AK 99522-1267
[REDACTED]

God Bless

Hi there Representative,

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. I know you are very busy and cannot read all the correspondence you receive. As a former employee of the Alaska legislature I know that staff often helps with that and I would urge whoever receives this in your office to please forward it on for your personal viewing.

As the Operations Manager and future owner of The Perrins' Rainy Pass Lodge, Alaska's oldest hunting lodge which was established well before Statehood, **I strongly oppose HB 137** and I urge you to stop the progress on it. I know that you want what is best for our great State because you serve in the legislature. I want you to fully realize the ramifications of what this bill would mean for the future of wildlife, hunting, ADF&G, tourism and income for our State. I have been deeply involved with developing and forming many hunting, guiding, fish and game statutes and regulations and they can be very controversial and complex. Thank you for taking the time to fully understand what this word change from 'May' to 'Shall' means for our wildlife.

The passing of this bill would tie the hands of the BOG to use their best discretion on many of the complex wildlife issues our State faces. We have 26 different game management units in Alaska (some of which are larger than other States), each with many sub-units. The variety of scenarios, habitat, animals and conditions is endless. To change the wording in our statutes to 'Shall' takes away a very large tool that the BOG may use to protect our wildlife resources which is the BOG's main role. The BOG was put in place to make these decisions through a public process with widespread input and research from experts, biologists and people in the field. The BOG is confirmed by you to be sure we are getting a diverse set of interests on the Board. They need all tools at their disposal to protect our wildlife and having the flexibility to alter the amount of non-residents in or out of certain areas plays a huge part in that for financial reasons as well as harvest goals set by the State biologists.

If the BOG 'has' to put all non-residents on a drawing system anytime a resident's opportunity isn't "reasonably satisfied" than that is the end of the guiding system in Alaska which is exactly what RHAK wants, I hope that is not what you want. The guiding industry is Alaska's original tourism industry, we bring in over \$78 million in revenue to the State from outside (that's new dollars in our State not recirculated money). Non-resident hunters pay for almost 80% of our wildlife departments bills and guided hunts represents less than 3% of hunters. The loss of that revenue to the state and the almost 2500 people we employ (including a lot of rural people) would be detrimental to the State. We simply cannot run a business if our customers have to draw to hunt. When the State got rid of guide areas on State land our area on Kodiak went to a drawing and each year we do not know if we will have 4 hunters, 2, or zero. Can you imagine running a business based on that...It's impossible That's why it is a very supplemental part of our business, we would not be in operation without our lodge area and over the counter purchased tags. We are bringing in a lot of millionaire and billionaire clients to this State, several of who would like to invest in our State if we are business friendly and with declining oil revenues we need to be looking at other streams of income to keep our State running strong. Bills like this that will effectively shut down an entire industry is not good for our State especially when the guiding industry does so much for our wildlife resources. We as guides fight tirelessly to protect those resources because it is our livelihood and we want them there for our grandchildren to enjoy and see. If we are not paying for and protecting them then who will? The non-hunting tourism industry does not put money towards paying for Fish and Wildlife like we do, yet they reap the benefits of healthy wildlife populations for their guests to view. It is essential that ADF&G has adequate funding for research and biologists. We face many wildlife issues like declining caribou herds, sheep disease issues, ticks arriving in Alaska...the list goes on and never ends. Resident hunters do not want to and/or cannot afford to pay the cost that non-residents are willing to pay. I as an Alaskan resident hunter can purchase a hunting license for \$48 and shoot, 2 brown bear, 1 moose, 1 sheep, 2 deer, several caribou, 5 black bear, 1 mt goat, 1 elk, and the list goes on (That is one heck of a good deal! And that's just in the general season, not to mention subsistence). A non-resident hunter would pay over \$8000 for those same animals!

I am a resident hunter first, I was born in Alaska and will never leave. I agree with and think that resident hunters should have priority over non-resident hunters. The system is already set up that way and resident hunters have wide spread access at a very cheap costs to hunt in a variety of ways to fill their freezers or look for that trophy sheep. I believe we need both resident and non-resident hunters and this bill would effectively eliminate most of the non-resident hunters. We are all residents of the United States of America, we should all get to enjoy the benefits that all States have to offer – how would we like it if we had to draw in every other State we wanted to hunt in? It's one thing if the animal numbers are so low that the BOG needs to put it on a drawing to protect the species, it's another issue if someone complains that their opportunity isn't "reasonably satisfied" – who defines that anyway? It is such a vague statement it could be argued many ways. That is why it is imperative that the BOG have the flexibility with the word 'May' to do their job based on the particular scenario. Please don't tie their hands on this!

Article 8 – Natural Resources States:

§ 2. General Authority

The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, **for the maximum benefit of its people.** *If this bill passes it will be going directly against the maximum benefit of its people because there will no longer be the financial means to develop, conserve and utilize those resources.*

§ 3. Common Use

Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for **common use.** *I cannot imagine a more common use than hunting and guiding hunts – one of Alaska's original industries, this bill will put us out of business and shut down the industry.*

§ 4. Sustained Yield

Fish, forests, wildlife, grasslands, and all other replenish able resources belonging to the State shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the **sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses.** *This bill directly contradicts the sustained yield principle because without the financial resources we cannot adequately employ biologists to study and come up with fixes to this huge State and its diverse wildlife populations. It also has to be subject to preferences among beneficial uses – The guiding industry is clearly a beneficial use.*

I hope that I have adequately made my points clear and would be happy to answer any questions you may have. I am currently at our lodge preparing for the Iron Dog, Ultra Sport, and Iditarod races as we are a checkpoint for them otherwise I would fly to Juneau to testify in person. We could not afford to have our lodge here and support those races and all the people who access this historic part of the Alaska Range if it was not for our hunting business which has supplied this lodge for over 80 years.

I will close the letter with one last point on RHAK who is pushing this bill – It is a real shame that with a declining number of hunters we have a newly found group whose sole purpose seems to be setting themselves at odd against another group of hunters. All of us hunters should be working together to keep our traditions and heritage alive because it is ultimately needed to protect our wildlife. Subsistence, resident, non-resident, we're all hunters and have bigger fights to face. I am close friends with several RHAK founding members and I can tell you that they joined RHAK for different reasons than this bill and are not aware or agree with the direction the group has been taken. AOC, SCI, RMEF, APHA and other's don't always agree on the details of every issue but they work together for the greater good. RHAK does not have a good relationship with any of those long standing reputable organizations.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this important issue, I will be attentively watching this bill.

Warm regards and God Bless,

Steve H. Perrins II

Rainy Pass Lodge – Operations Manager

www.theperrinsrainypasslodge.com

[REDACTED]

Anchorage, AK 99522-1267

[REDACTED]

God Bless

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Steven H. Perrins II [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 10:08 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: RE: HB 137 - OPPOSE - Very Important!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi again Representatives,

I just finished watching your committee meeting for HB 137. I wish I could be there or at least call in to testify as this is a very crucial issue that would put a lot of guides out of business. I am busy getting our lodge (Rainy Pass Lodge) ready for the Iron Dog racers who are speeding their way to our lodge as I write this letter. They arrive here on Friday, your next scheduled public testimony time so I will not be able to call in for that, but I will watch the hearing after I attend to our guests. I hope you read this and consider it when you look at the ramifications this bill presents.

The two main reasons that were stated for this bill by its sponsor and by RHAK is

- 1) to put food on the table of Alaskan's and
- 2) to be sure that Alaskan's have a preference/priority to hunt over non-resident's.

I as an Alaskan resident do not see where there is currently a problem in those two areas.

- 1) Food on the table – for a \$45 hunting license I can shoot 20 caribou, 2 deer, 1 moose, 1 mt goat, 1 sheep, 2 brown bear, 5 black bear, then my wife can shoot each of those and each of my two kids can shoot each of those, plus I can probably go to other areas and harvest more game ...how much meat can a family of four eat in a year? As stated in testimony today, non-resident hunters donate thousands of pounds of food each year. We personally donate a lot of meat to our community, the native hospital, and the local fire department as well as eat it ourselves (we are Alaskan residents too!)
- 2) In response to a question, RHAK's executive director stated something about no resident preference areas but after doing a very quick 5 minute scan of the hunting regulations I found the following areas where resident hunters have quite a drastic allowance of opportunity far above and beyond non-residents including: resident only hunting seasons, longer seasons, more animals allowed to harvest, less restriction on what residents can harvest, over the counter hunts for residents verse drawing hunts for non-resident etc.

Here is what I found:

Unit 3 – resident only brown bear season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 8 – longer season on Mt Goat by 3 months for residents

Unit 9 – no closed season on brown bear for residents – non-residents can only hunt every other spring/fall and can only harvest 1 bear every 4 years

Unit 9ABCE resident only caribou season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 13 resident only caribou season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 15AC resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 17 resident only caribou season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 18 in certain parts resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 19AB resident only caribou season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 19A resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed

Unit 22AE in certain parts 20 caribou allowed (bulls or cows) for residents in a “no closed season” area, non-residents may shoot 1 bull within a two month time frame

Unit 22BD in certain parts 20 caribou allowed (bulls or cows) for residents – the State “may” announce an opening for non-residents and allow them 1 bull.

Unit 22AD resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed
UNIT 23 resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed
Unit 26A resident only moose season – no non-residents allowed
Unit 26 in certain parts resident only sheep season – no non-residents allowed

Now how can anyone say that residents don't have a preference over non-residents or enough opportunity to put food on the tables? In fact what this bill would do is take the food off the table of many professional guides who make a living and livelihood by guiding hunts – talk about true subsistence, full time guides take people in the field to harvest animals as the sole way to make a living and provide for their families, so what this word change would do is take food off their (guides) table's.

How would this word change put guides out of business was also brought up. I would like to try and describe that to you with a real life example of my Dad. He purchased a guide concession area on State land in Kodiak in the 1980's right before guide concessions went away on State land. He lost almost \$200,000 over night. Now it was his dream since he was 6 years old to be an Alaskan hunting guide – he saved up through high school and drove from New Hampshire to Alaska when he was 19. He arrived with \$8 in his pocket and went to work. When he had rights to the guide concession area he was guaranteed, at the time, 6 permits a year to hunt brown bear. He could make a modest living on the 6 brown bear hunters because he could book his client's 2 years out and charge enough to make a living. Now remember resident hunters were still allowed to go hunt there, the concession only referred to number of guides in that area. When the guide concessions went away they had to put that area on a drawing for non-residents because there were too many guides competing for the very limited number of bears that F&G would allow to be harvested out of that area. Now instead of 6 guaranteed hunters each year we have anywhere between 0 and 4 and we don't know if we have anyone until the drawing 1-3 months prior. You simply cannot run a legitimate full time business like that, you cannot invest in the area and the accommodations and it is difficult to plan. The experience is not as good for our guests. So my Dad had to get another line of work to provide for his family and take hunters as a supplemental part of his income – not as a main business. He has kept that up for over 40 years because it is his passion, but please understand the difference between a supplemental income through a drawing system hunt verse an actual business. I do not know of any full time guide who can run a business of a drawing system. My Dad has worked hard and kept at it and eventually purchased Alaska's oldest hunting lodge (Rainy Pass Lodge) where he started in the late 1970's. This is our families full time business and livelihood, three generations of us are currently working at it.

The other question asked in relation to this is that it would only effect areas with low game populations and the problem is that the actual wording says "resident hunters opportunity isn't reasonably satisfied" which can mean a very wide variety of things – if you ask RHAK's executive director they wouldn't be satisfied unless there was less than 10% non-resident/guided opportunity – just look at the proposals they've put forth to the Board of Game asking for that very thing. The Board of Game is not perfect and I do not always agree with their decisions but it is a fair, open, public process! Anyone can put forth a proposal! We have seen some of the best conservation results in the world right here in Alaska because of that process – do not tie their hands and limit their tools and options on how to manage our wildlife. In the 1950's there were about 20,000 brown bear in Alaska, now there are over 45,000. Yes some caribou herds are declining and that needs to be seriously looked at. I am sure there are many factors and considerations. No one wants animal populations to decline but guides especially don't because our entire livelihood is dependant on healthy populations that we can pass down to our grandchildren. I am a second generation guide and want my two young kids to enjoy this gift we have here in Alaska. We as guides care so much for the wildlife that many of us have even called in to beg F&G to close seasons when we saw population problems. We personally even cancelled hunts and returned money when the State refused to close seasons because we felt the population was fragile at the time due to a harsh winter. Guides get painted as money hungry bad guys sometimes but we truly care and do a lot to protect the wildlife for all Alaskans, including helping local youth get involved with hunting and teaching hunter education classes to local Alaskans.

Finally I would like to comment on Rep. Lincoln's question. Rep. Lincoln kept trying to ask what guides thought about the roughly 50% harvest rate on non-resident hunters in a certain herd of caribou that had shown declining numbers. I will agree that it does not sound good when put like that and I am not familiar with that herd, the BOG's decision, the

thoughts behind it etc. It would probably be beneficial to hear someone speak who was involved with that process. What I can say is that there are many factors to why non-resident guided harvest may be higher in certain particular areas. For starters the average resident hunter does not typically spend the extra money to charter flights and access these remote areas that take a lot of time and money to get to. They also do not usually take as much time off work...maybe they hunt an extended weekend but if it's bad weather they aren't as successful. On the other hand guides are professionals who live in the remote areas a good part of the year, they know and study the game and the terrain, they are properly equipped and provide longer hunts 10, 12, 15 even 21 day hunts. In Alaska weather is the biggest thing you're fighting and the longer you can stay out the higher your chances of successful harvest is. I am not as upset about equal harvest rates (if the population can stand it) as I would be about the opportunity. My question would be what is the resident opportunity like in that area? Are they allowed to take more caribou? Do they have a longer season? Are they allowed to shoot cows, when non-residents can only shoot bulls? Maybe the residents were allowed to shoot cows and that's what BOG took away because with declining numbers you want to preserve the cows (non-residents are typically only allowed bulls) Maybe they wanted to allow non-residents to keep hunting a limited number of bulls because while they are there they also harvest bears and wolves which helps to protect the caribou numbers. If the residents do not have decent "opportunity" in that area then maybe it should be brought to the BOG's attention as I do believe that residents should have priority...and I believe they do! Like RHAK's executive director even stated it's already in our statutes and in the hunting regulations page 7 that residents have priority.

Thanks again for your time on this very important issue, I truly hope you see the problems that will result from this bill and that you do not pass it out of committee.

Warm regards,

Steve H. Perrins II

Rainy Pass Lodge – Operations Manager

www.theperrinsrainypasslodge.com

[REDACTED]

Anchorage, AK 99522-1267

[REDACTED]

God Bless

Elle Ahkivgak

From: aaron bloomquist [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 8:37 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: Fwd: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

See below

Sent from Aaron Bloomquist's iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: aaron bloomquist [REDACTED]
Date: February 18, 2020 at 11:45:08 PM AKST
To: "rep.chris.tuck@akleg.gov" <rep.chris.tuck@akleg.gov>, "rep.geran.tarr@akleg.gov" <rep.geran.tarr@akleg.gov>, "Representative.David.Talerico@akleg.gov" <Representative.David.Talerico@akleg.gov>, "Representative.Grier.Hopkins@akleg.gov" <Representative.Grier.Hopkins@akleg.gov>, "Representative.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov" <Representative.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov>, "Representative.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov" <Representative.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>, "Representative.Sara.Rasmussen@akleg.gov" <Representative.Sara.Rasmussen@akleg.gov>, "Representative.Ivy.Spohnholz@akleg.gov" <Representative.Ivy.Spohnholz@akleg.gov>, "rep.john.lincoln@akleg.gov" <rep.john.lincoln@akleg.gov>, "Representative.Colleen.Sullivan-Leonard@akleg.gov" <Representative.Colleen.Sullivan-Leonard@akleg.gov>
Cc: Angie Bloomquist [REDACTED]
Subject: HB 137

Representatives Sullivan Leonard, Talerico, [Et.al](#),

Please carefully consider your deliberations of HB 137. We believe this is an ill advised Bill that has the potential to be devastating to hundreds of small, rural family businesses.

We live in House District 6 at our camp in Copper Center in the Spring, Summer, and part of the Fall, and District 7 in the Winter. We run a small, family oriented, conservation focused tourism, hunting and fishing business with operations in The Arctic Refuge, Copper River Valley, and Prince Williams Sound. Angie is the grand daughter of a pioneering Alaska Master Guide Cleo McMahan and Aaron has worked in the outdoor industry in Alaska for two decades. Our Children: Makayla (2 months) and Samantha (8 yoa) are both 4th Generation Alaskans, our son Tyler (10 yoa) is Indigenous (Inupiaq). All of our children accompany us in our hunting and fishing camps. This lifestyle provides us with a modest living harvesting renewable resources while attracting mostly NEW money to the Alaskan Economy from

outside sources. We provide meat to some 10-20 families per year in rural Alaska from Fort Yukon to Chitina and points in between. We have approximately 15 different people that we employ at some point during the year. Some of these people work for several months and some for just one or two hunts or fishing trips. All of these employees are Alaskans except one. We believe in this lifestyle and conservation for the next generation. We have contributed approximately 20% of our annual income and thousands of volunteer hours over the last 15 years to conservation organizations.

HB 137 is vague enough that the meaning is not especially clear. Any discernible interpretation is very concerning. There is reason to believe the intent of the Group (Resident Hunters of Alaska) that solicited this Bill was to mandate drawing permit hunts for ALL non-resident hunters. This same group is currently telling some of their members that their goal is to totally eliminate Hunting Guiding as a way of life in Alaska and they have lost several founding members over this recent ultra-radical position. Their plan to accomplish this is roughly: #1 Fight any attempt at a Conservation Based DNR Guide Concession Program on State Lands in hopes that unrestricted guiding will "crash the system" (These type of Concessions work flawlessly in other jurisdictions for resident hunters, guides, and conservation of the resource) #2 Force all Nonresidents to a Drawing Permit system for all species. (HB137) #3 Eliminate the safety and conservation based rule that Nonresidents must be guided for sheep, goats, and brown bears, causing the need for a drawing system and eliminating at least 50% of ALL guided hunting in the process.

HB 137 could be interpreted to mean all Nonresident Hunters would be forced to draw a tag for all species. This interpretation would force our family completely out of a business that we have and spent 20 years, and our life savings, building from the ground up. Bankruptcy at middle age, with three kids, is not an attractive or fair proposition for people that work hard and do things right. Drawing permit hunts are worth about 50% of over-the-counter hunting due to the uncertainty of clients getting tags. Permit draws force Guides to solicit dozens (or hundreds, depending on draw odds) of hunters that would like to participate and can afford the given hunt. The only guides that would survive this type of scheme are large operators affiliated with outside "booking agencies" with very large client lists. Even these guides may struggle to survive with decreased opportunity, and revenue; and increased overhead.

Another interpretation of HB 137 would be that the Board of Game needs to re-examine every single hunt, statewide, to determine if the "opportunity for state residents to take big game can be reasonably satisfied". The Board already does this with every single decision it makes. This would cost Millions of Dollars for nothing but redundancy. The Board can already mandate drawing permit hunts or totally eliminate Non-Resident hunting in areas of relative shortage and does so regularly, where appropriate.

The Board of Game Process in Alaska is the most public and open wildlife regulatory body in the World. Any Alaskan can write proposals to change regulations and work with Board Members to make their voice heard. There are sometimes up to two hundred public testifiers and thousands of written comments at BOG Meetings where hot topics are discussed. I suspect this Bill will get a small fraction of that level of public input. We have attended dozens of BOG Meetings and, although we are not always happy with the outcome, we believe in this extraordinary process.

In closing, Nonresident Hunters provide an opportunity for Alaskans to make a living in rural areas while attracting 100% new money to the Alaskan Economy. Alaska Registered/Guide-Outfitters are Alaskans at a much higher rate (approximately 90% according to DCCED statistics), than virtually any other resource industry. This is much higher than Commercial Fishing, Fishing Guides, General Tourism, Oil and Gas, Logging, and comparable only to the Mining Industry. Article 8 Section 1 of the Alaska Constitution states: "It is the policy of the State to encourage the settlement of its land and the development of its resources by making them available for **maximum use** consistent with the public interest." Section 2 states: "The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, for the **maximum benefit of its people**." Eliminating many, if not most, Nonresident Hunters, and therefore Guided Hunting, simply to appease a relatively small group of radical Resident Hunters that would rather not have any competition does NOT provide for "Maximum use" nor does it provide "maximum benefit of its people". This scheme only provides a benefit for those few selfish Resident Hunters wishing to eliminate as many other people in the field as they can. It does not provide any benefit what-so-ever to hunters or non hunters that benefit from the economic impact, shared meat, or other benefits of the Guided Hunting lifestyle, to the contrary, it harms these Alaskans by incrementally harming the Alaskan Economy and forcing their friends and neighbors that live this lifestyle out of business.

Thank you for your consideration,

Aaron & Angie Bloomquist



www.alaskaoutfittersunlimited.com

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Parker Guide Service [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 1:05 PM
To: Rep. Chris Tuck; Rep. John Lincoln; Rep. Geran Tarr; Rep. David Talerico; Rep. Grier Hopkins; Rep. Sara Hannan; Rep. George Rauscher; Rep. Sara Rasmussen; Rep. Ivy Spohnholz; House Resources; representitave.jonathan.kreiss@akleg.gov; senator.bert.steman@akleg.gov
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Representatives and all concerned:

In regards to the forth coming Bill HB 137, please find our sincere concerns!

This bill as written will in fact hugely impact the hunting guide industry as a whole, let alone individually in Alaska likely with a 50% foreseeable reduction in hunts available for non-residents and also the diminished value of the hunts that can be sold because of the uncertainty of the availability of them. This is a huge decline in revenue an opportunity, that is in our opinion needlessly and self seemingly being put forth for consideration as law. This is on top of an already deflated oil industry income to the State, just what we need another industry financial crises , and brought on unnecessarily. This in our opinion, would be alot like if Alaska residents decided all the oil in Ak. is for Alaskans only, and only pump out exactly what we as Alaskan can use, cause we want it all even though there is tons and tons that can be exported, marketed or taken for use otherwise, This would cause a huge loss of jobs and income to the State and many of the residents living and working here, just like this bill HB 137 will do if passed as it is written. With the words (shall) and (reasonable) in this HB 137 Bill is force full, as well as the word reasonable has no way to define it what that actually is or means, and can go as far either way as the person at that time defining it can or wants to take it, regardless of scientific research and or support and or public input from experienced operators and people. This would and will have disastrous consequences to all concerned and depending who is in charge defining it to their current whims will certainly cause the issue to go way lopsided one way or the other!

This is a blanket Bill for the whole State regardless of land status, ownership, and or harvest levels, and wildlife populations. This is in direct conflict with the management that is now and has been done on all federal lands in the State already, and is very successfully keeping wildlife populations up to max proportions and opportunities for all residents and non-residents alike. Some State areas may be a little more affected with the less regulation they have, but this bill written the way it is, is not the answer for this either. There is many limits already in place that effect the non-resident and not the resident hunter, on all federal lands, and State as well. Limit non-res seasons, limit methods and means, selective closures of non-res hunts, and controlled use ares.

This is as is, will and would be a huge financial crises and impact to all the hunt guiding industry in Alaska, who provides the very huge majority of income for the State Fish and Game, and research and management. This in turn helps the residents so they can have cheap inexpensive hunt licenses and tags, and keeps seasons open to them from the folks who hate hunting and want it all to end through the Scientific studies and Surveys done by the Fish and Game proving the benefit of hunting of the certain species. With out this income or being reduced by up to 50%, everyone is going to loose, including the AK. RESIDENTS. Further more as guides trying to sell drawing hunts with no certainty of doing so, will in fact lessen thr high value of these hunts and the animal pursued, futher making a financial impact on not only the States economy but each individuals guides and their home town area economy as well, with 1000's of jobs lost in the industry. The fees from the non-hunters have been used to make a huge conservation success story in Alaska, this would end this story and likely end hunting opportunities for all including Residents if HB 137 passed as is.

This will make our 36th year guiding hunters in Alaska, 6 as a assistant guide and 30 as our own business, we full support our are and towns with our business as we are full time Alaskans and live here in Se. Ak. full time year around. We have invested our lives and all our income to providing a small but high quality service and success to our high end clients, who in turn or paying high value for these hunts with the benefits going to the AK. fish and Game and conservation and the full profits go back into the AK. economy where we live. We spend all local, food, fuel, guides, cooks, service and repairs etc, etc, this is a very concerning bill that will be very destructive to not only us as guides and our local and state economy, but will in turn lessen the opportunity of AK. residents to hunt due to alot higher license and tag fees that will have to be implemented and loss of actual hunts due to the science not being there to support it, because of lack of funds to the F&G to do so,

Thank-you for your consideration to our concern with this HB 137 Bill>

Sincerely

Bruce & Ann-Marie Parker

[REDACTED]

Sitka Ak. 99835

Parker Guide Serivce Inc.

[REDACTED]

Sitka, AK. 99835

[REDACTED]

www.alaskaboathunts.com

www.alaskaboatcruises.com

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Bearfoot Adventures, LLC [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 12:57 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to respectfully oppose HB 137. It is clear that the RHAK association is set on eliminating the guiding industry in Alaska based on the multiple initiatives they are pursuing. Guiding is a very seasonal business and although guides charge well for their services, the overall yearly income for the average guiding business is not very much once all expenses are paid, especially for small family businesses. Further reducing the opportunities for non-resident hunters will drive most guiding businesses out of business since they will not be able to plan a season, commit hunting dates to clients, nor will they have sufficient income to sustain their household. RHAK realizes this and is taking the strategy of limiting non-resident opportunity under the pretense of righteousness for resident hunters. This is evident by the law suit they have filed against the BOG . One of their agendas is to severely reduce the non-resident opportunity for Kodiak bear hunts. The numbers that they are proposing are so low that it will essentially wipe out brown bear guiding on Kodiak because it will not be worth keeping the infrastructure and equipment required to operate on Kodiak, and Kodiak bears are not even a subsistence animal for resident hunters. As a note, the current Kodiak brown bear hunting model is a beacon of success for Alaska and the rest of the country for that matter. It is, and should be, used as an example of how to manage an ecosystem.

Should initiatives like these pass, there will be a cascade effect since resident hunters do not bring the funding to the state like non-residents do. The following is a list of items that will be impacted:

Big Game Commercial Services will not have the income from guide licenses and will have difficulty funding a staff to regulate the industry thus reducing jobs.

Non Resident hunters provide the lion's share of funding for ADF&G through license fees. ADF&G will not be able to be funded like they are now and conservation of the animals will be impacted. If license fees are passed on to resident hunters who currently do not have to buy hunting licenses and most tags, I suspect many of them will quit hunting.

Current Big Game guides may leave the state and go to the lower 48 to guide in another state or find another line of work thus removing tax base.

Air charters, hotels, restaurants, sporting goods stores, etc... will be impacted.

Many guides have invested in real estate, boats, airplanes, and other very expensive infrastructure to conduct their business. Many could go bankrupt without non-resident hunters.

I employ guides, pilots, cooks, taxidermists, etc., in my business as do almost all guides. The majority of this business will be gone which will cause businesses to fail.

The Board of Game has ample tools to provide reasonable opportunities for resident hunters and has done so by utilizing resident only seasons, controlled use areas, tier permits, etc...

I am adamantly opposed to HB 137. I am an Alaskan resident that relies heavily on my guiding/outfitting business which is primarily non-resident clients. My livelihood will be destroyed with this bill. My guiding business is how I provide for my family and I see how the livelihood of other people's families will be adversely affected; our clients turn into their clients. Many businesses benefit, directly and indirectly, from non-resident hunters.

Thank you for your time,

Chet Benson

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Bearfoot Adventures, LLC [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:03 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Second Submittal

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to respectfully oppose HB 137. It is clear that the RHAK association is set on eliminating the guiding industry in Alaska based on the multiple initiatives they are pursuing. Guiding is a very seasonal business and although guides charge well for their services, the overall yearly income for the average guiding business is not very much once all expenses are paid, especially for small family businesses. Further reducing the opportunities for non-resident hunters will drive most guiding businesses out of business since they will not be able to plan a season, commit hunting dates to clients, nor will they have sufficient income to sustain their household. RHAK realizes this and is taking the strategy of limiting non-resident opportunity under the pretense of righteousness for resident hunters. This is evident by the law suit they have filed against the BOG . One of their agendas is to severely reduce the non-resident opportunity for Kodiak bear hunts. The numbers that they are proposing are so low that it will essentially wipe out brown bear guiding on Kodiak because it will not be worth keeping the infrastructure and equipment required to operate on Kodiak, and Kodiak bears are not even a subsistence animal for resident hunters. As a note, the current Kodiak brown bear hunting model is a beacon of success for Alaska and the rest of the country for that matter. It is, and should be, used as an example of how to manage an ecosystem.

Should initiatives like these pass, there will be a cascade effect since resident hunters do not bring the funding to the state like non-residents do. The following is a list of items that will be impacted:

Big Game Commercial Services will not have the income from guide licenses and will have difficulty funding a staff to regulate the industry thus reducing jobs.

Non Resident hunters provide the lion's share of funding for ADF&G through license fees. ADF&G will not be able to be funded like they are now and conservation of the animals will be impacted. If license fees are passed on to resident hunters who currently do not have to buy hunting licenses and most tags, I suspect many of them will quit hunting.

Current Big Game guides may leave the state and go to the lower 48 to guide in another state or find another line of work thus removing tax base.

Air charters, hotels, restaurants, sporting goods stores, etc... will be impacted.

Many guides have invested in real estate, boats, airplanes, and other very expensive infrastructure to conduct their business. Many could go bankrupt without non-resident hunters.

I employ guides, pilots, cooks, taxidermists, etc., in my business as do almost all guides. The majority of this business will be gone which will cause businesses to fail.

The Board of Game has ample tools to provide reasonable opportunities for resident hunters and has done so by utilizing resident only seasons, controlled use areas, tier permits, etc...

I am adamantly opposed to HB 137. I am an Alaskan resident that relies heavily on my guiding/outfitting business which is primarily non-resident clients. My livelihood will be destroyed with this bill. My guiding business is how I provide for my family and I see how the livelihood of other people's families will be adversely affected; our clients turn into their clients. Many businesses benefit, directly and indirectly, from non-resident hunters.

Thank you for your time,

Chet Benson

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Joey Klutsch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 9:19 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: hb 137 opposition letter
Attachments: Joey Klutsch HB137 opposition.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

--

Joey Klutsch
Registered Guide
Aniakchak Guide Service
Katmai Guide Service

[REDACTED]
King Salmon, AK 99613

[REDACTED]
www.joeyklutsch.com

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Joe Klutsch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 9:18 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: hb 137 opposition
Attachments: hb137 opposition.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please see attached letter.

--

Joe Klutsch
Katmai Guide Service
Master Guide

[REDACTED]

King Salmon, Alaska 99613

[REDACTED]

www.katmaiguideservice.com

joeklutsch@gmail.com

Dear Representatives,

My name is Joey Klutsch, and I am a second-generation full time Registered Guide in rural Alaska. I have lived in King Salmon, AK my entire life. I serve on the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee. Guiding accounts for the vast majority - nearly all of - my family's income. I am writing in opposition to HB137. In addition to being a guide and outfitter, I am also an avid resident hunter, primarily for subsistence use.

HB137 is an unnecessary bill, which is aimed at undermining nonresident hunting opportunity and particularly the guiding profession. There is tremendous resident hunting opportunity in Alaska, both in areas that are draw hunts and in non-draw areas. Furthermore, the Board of Game can and does limit non-resident seasons and bag limits when needed, can limit methods and means, can close non-resident hunts as required, and set controlled use areas. Any person or group can submit proposals to the Board of Game if they so choose. Without a biological justification there is no absolutely no reason to limit non-resident opportunity. Let the Board of Game make these decisions.

The financial implications from this bill are hard to overstate. The majority of Fish and Game's wildlife division's funding comes from the sale of non-resident licenses and tags. This is money that non-resident hunters are more than happy to pay – and which resident hunters pay very little for. HB137 and the cuts to non-resident opportunity will severely inhibit the department's funding. Furthermore, a great many Alaskan's, including myself, depend on guiding for a living. I personally employ many Alaska residents who earn a major portion of their yearly income from guiding. This bill threatens our very livelihoods. The vast majority of money we earn is spent in Alaska, and the non-resident hunters we guide spend huge amounts of money each year in the state, not just with us but at the many stores, hotels, air taxis, etc which support the guiding industry. The effects of this income in rural Alaskan areas such as King Salmon, where I live, are even more pronounced.

Drawn hunts are the surest way to destroy sustainable guiding businesses. Besides reducing or eliminating non-resident allocation, the surest way to put an end to full time guide businesses is with permit draw hunts and the destabilizing effects and uncertainty they bring. You simply cannot run a business not knowing how many hunters you may or may not draw. With the loss of these businesses will go countless jobs, most of which are resident Alaskan's.

Again, most importantly, it is the job of the Board of Game to set seasons and bag limits and methods and means and to select closures of non-resident hunts. They should be allowed to do their job based on sound biological data. HB137 uses intangibles such as “resident hunting opportunity is being reasonably satisfied” which is virtually impossible to define, and is only another step to limit and restrict guiding and non-resident opportunity. I urge you to oppose this bill.

Joey Klutsch

Registered Guide 1277

Aniakchak Guide Service

Dear Representatives,

I am writing you to state my opposition to HB137. I have lived in rural Alaska for approaching 50 years now. I founded my guiding business in 1976. I have actively been guiding sport fishermen and hunters as my main source of income for all that time. I have also served nearly 40 consecutive years on our local Fish and Game Advisory Committee, and have attended countless Board of Game and Board of Fish meetings along with Federal Regional Council meetings. I have continued to make the management of Alaska's big game resources one of the primary studies in my career. My hunting activities have taken me to the Wrangel Mountains, South East Alaska, Kodiak, the Alaska Peninsula, Western Alaska, the Alaska Range and the Brooks Range. My experience has taught me that allocation fights are often misguided and for those most affected, have unintended consequences.

The Alaska Board of Game has the ability to ensure that resident opportunity is met and has consistently done so for the last 50 years. Where justified, they have set limits on non-resident seasons, hunting methods and means, imposed selective closures of non-resident hunts and established control use areas, all to the betterment of general resident hunters. This is an undeniable fact. If any individual or organization choses to make proposals which have been carefully crafted and have some reasonable biological or allocative purpose, they may do so. If their initial proposals are rejected, they may continue to submit the same or similar proposals and re-argue their case. Because you do not get all of what you want in a Board of Game cycle does not justify seeking a legislative remedy which has wide sweeping long term negative impacts. If one accepts the premise of this bill, you might as well include non-resident sport fishing.

Passage of this bill would have catastrophic impact on the ADF&G division of wildlife conservation's budget. 70% or more of this budget annually comes from the sale of non-resident licenses and tag fees. Just a few years ago the guiding industry advocated for the doubling of these fees for the purpose of ensuring that ADF&G would have the funds to do its job. What's more, resident fees are very minimal and in fact in the Board of Game regulation process, there are continued and ongoing efforts to exempt resident fees. For example, a non-resident pays \$1000 for a brown/grizzly tag, and a resident pays only \$25. If license and tag fee revenues from out of state hunters were reduced by 25 million dollars annually, then who will fill the funding gap? - resident hunters? Will resident hunters pay \$1,000 for a brown bear tag? With the state's current budget situation, it simply doesn't make sense.

Additionally, in most areas of the state, including those where permit drawings occur, there are more than ample opportunities for residents to hunt for big game. There are vast areas of Alaska where brown bear, dall sheep, moose and caribou are not on permit drawing. Lastly, the impact of this legislation on guides and their families would be devastating. The guiding industry generates 30 million dollars or more to the state economy each year. 1,000 jobs or more would be lost for both urban and rural residents. Other support industries such as airlines, hotels, sporting good stores, restaurants, taxidermists, grocery stores and fuel supply outlets would be significantly damaged. And, most guide operations are family run businesses. Think about their incomes. This legislation would have very negative consequences for all affected parties including residents. Without adequate funding for the Department of Fish and Game, management for the long-term conservation of Alaska's wildlife resource will be diminished.

Thank you for considering my views on this subject.

Respectfully,

Joe Klutsch,
Master Guide 91

King Salmon, Alaska

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Donna Claus [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:34 AM
To: House Resources; [REDACTED]
Cc: Paul
Subject: HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Honorable House Resources Committee Members,

We are opposed to HB 137.

We own and operate a fly-in adventure lodge in the Wrangell/St. Elias National Park. We take eco tourists and have 3 guided hunting concessions within the park.

The Claus family guides came to this area in the early 1960's and the 4th generation since then is a hunting guide in the area now.

The wording of the bill leaves some questions.

Sec. 16.05.256. Nonresident and nonresident alien permits. Whenever it is necessary to restrict the taking of big game so that the opportunity for state residents to take big game can be reasonably satisfied in accordance with sustained yield principles, the Board of Game shall [MAY], through a permit system, limit the taking of big game by nonresidents and nonresident aliens to accomplish that purpose.

This statement in green is all about hunters, not animals. This bill is set up in such a way that THE OPPORTUNITY for any state resident to hunt is to be "reasonably satisfied" (does this mean happy or sort of happy or what?) IF a state hunter is NOT reasonably satisfied he can complain and the Board of Game will HAVE to put in a permit system on that hunt that limits nonresidents and nonresident aliens.

This smells a bit like choosing an area to hunt and then getting rid of competition so you have your private hunting areas.

This bill is masquerading as a protection for the resource, BUT it really is a way to kick out nonresident hunters in any hunt anyone chooses to not be reasonably satisfied with in WHATEVER way.

Since nonresident hunters use professional guides a great deal of time, it is a concerted effort to strip us of our rights to take hunters thus getting rid of competition.

Respectively submitted,

Paul and Donna Claus
www.ultimathulelodge.com

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Jeff Burwell [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:58 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB137
Attachments: HB137.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

February 17, 2020

OPPOSITION TO HB137

To those who will read this,

My name is Jeff Burwell, I am a longtime Alaska resident and have been a hunting guide since 1989. For more then 20 years I have been delivering over 10,000 pounds of moose meat annually to the local village elders. Currently my guide business brings in good income and employ's up to 10 Alaska residents. This income is mostly all new revenue that is brought from outside Alaska and is spent in Alaska. These outside dollars from nonresident hunters is what mostly funds our Fish and Game Department Conservation Programs. It is THE reason that Alaska Resident and Non-Resident hunters have the greatest opportunities of any state in our Nation to hunt big-game.

This current RHAK produced HB137 is not being pushed for conservation, or biological concerns. How can a drawing system that is only applied to the smallest user group be even close to reasonable in a conservation model? It is simply being pushed by a group led by a handful of hunters who see guided non-resident hunter as competition in the pursuit of trophies. They are trying to use the legislature to take out fellow hunters who they see as competition as they seek to harvest record book Heads and put Awards on the wall. They don't care that it will remove Millions of dollars spent on conservation or that it could effect 100's or 1000's of Alaskan jobs and tens of millions of dollars of outside revenue brought into our state. Nonresident hunters have continued to pay higher fees for licenses, tags, and special permits so that they can also hunt this great state. They are committed to pay as they understand the need for conservation effort's so that we all have animals to pursue.

Im not sure what HB137 means by "reasonable resident opportunity". As a resident hunter of Alaska we can each hunt and harvest the following each and every year:

- 3 - Black Bear
- 2 - Brown/Grizzly Bear
- unlimited - Caribou
- 6 - Deer
- 2 - Goat
- 2 - Moose
- 1 - Sheep
- unlimited - Wolf
- 1- Wolverine
- permit - Bison and Muskox

I feel we have a very good "reasonable resident opportunity " so I would ask you not to take my livelihood away from me and my family just to appease a small clique of Alaskan hunters. I oppose this HB137 as the management of our fish and game should be left in the hands of our Biologists and Board of Game not lawmakers and Special Interest Groups.

Sincerely
Jeff Burwell
Master Guide #162 Wasilla Alaska

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Lance Kronberger [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 9:12 AM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB137
Attachments: HB137.docx; Untitled attachment 00014.htm; HB137 - Nikki Kronberger.docx; Untitled attachment 00017.htm; Signature.jpg; Untitled attachment 00020.htm

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please see the attached letters. We would like these included in the public record for HB137.

February 18, 2020

Re: HB137

Dear Legislators,

I am a 16-year Alaska resident who owns and operates a hunting & fishing guide service with my husband. I have held an assistant guide license in AK and my husband and I, along with our two children, make our entire income off of our small family business.

I am writing you in OPPOSITION TO HB137.

I am not exactly sure what the definition of "Reasonable Resident Opportunity" means but as a resident of Alaska, who has a family who hunts in Alaska, we already have more than a "Reasonable Opportunity" to harvest game in Alaska. To mandate the Alaska Board of Game to determine if "resident hunting opportunity is being reasonably satisfied" would be a huge mistake, and very ambiguous.

My son has harvested a Goat, Grizzly Bear, Moose, Caribou, & Sitka Black tail Deer, and he is only 14. My daughter has harvested a moose at the age of 8. I have harvested two Grizzly bears, Dall Sheep, Moose, Goat, and Sitka black tail Deer. I have also harvested Rocky Mtn Bighorn Sheep & Desert Sheep. My husband has also harvested multiple Alaska Big Game animals; I think our family is a prime example of "resident hunting opportunity being satisfied".

Being a hunter that has hunted in many other states and countries, Alaska has the most fair and open process to the development of hunting regulations. The Alaska BOG does a very good job at managing the game of Alaska. My husband has attended many of the BOG meetings and they already make sure that "resident opportunity is being satisfied" mandating it would just give reason for people to file suit against the BOG.

The great job that the Alaska BOG is doing is very obvious in the fact that there is no other place in the world that residents have as much opportunity to hunt multiple big game species, at virtually no cost! The fact that residents of Alaska get to hunt, and have the management of game paid by non-resident hunters, is unbelievable. The current balance of resident, and non-resident hunters makes Alaska one of the best places in the world to live and raise a family in the outdoors.

If HB137 was to be legislated there would be disastrous affects on the guiding and transporting community, ADFG, and all the providers associated with the non-resident hunters. The guiding and transporting industry are primarily made up of Alaska Residents who own, operate, and employ Alaska residents. The negative economic effects would be huge, not only to the people associated with the guiding and transporting industry, but also the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. It would also put in jeopardy the ability for us to support our family with our small business.

I urge you to OPPOSE HB137

Sincerely,

Nikki Kronberger

[REDACTED]

Eagle River, AK 99577

[REDACTED]

February 17, 2020

Re: HB137

Dear Legislators,

I am a 16-year Alaska resident who owns and operates a hunting & fishing guide service. My wife and I, along with our two children, make our entire income off of our small family business.

I am writing you in OPPOSITION TO HB137.

I am not exactly sure what the definition of "Reasonable Resident Opportunity" means but as a resident of Alaska, who has a family who hunts in Alaska, we already have more than a "Reasonable Opportunity" to harvest game in Alaska. To mandate the Alaska Board of Game to determine if "resident hunting opportunity is being reasonably satisfied" would be a huge mistake, and very ambiguous.

My son has harvested a Goat, Grizzly Bear, Moose, Caribou, & Sitka Black tail Deer, and he is only 14. My daughter has harvested a moose at the age of 8. My wife has harvested, two Grizzly bears, Dall Sheep, Moose, Goat, and Sitka black tail Deer. I have also harvested multiple Alaska Big Game animals; I think our family is a prime example of "resident hunting opportunity being satisfied".

Being a hunter that has hunted in many other states and countries, Alaska has the most fair and open process to the development of hunting regulations. The Alaska BOG does a very good job at managing the game of Alaska. I have attended many of the BOG meetings and they already make sure that "resident opportunity is being satisfied" mandating it would just give reason for people to file suit against the BOG.

The great job that the Alaska BOG is doing is very obvious in the fact that there is no other place in the world that residents have as much opportunity to hunt multiple big game species, at virtually no cost! The fact that residents of Alaska get to hunt, and have the management of game paid by non-resident hunters, is unbelievable. The current balance of resident, and non-resident hunters makes Alaska one of the best places in the world to live and raise a family in the outdoors.

If HB137 was to be legislated there would be disastrous affects on the guiding and transporting community, ADFG, and all the providers associated with the non-resident hunters. The guiding and transporting industry are primarily made up of Alaska Residents who own, operate, and employ Alaska residents. The negative economic effects would be huge, not only to the people associated with the guiding and transporting industry, but also the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. It would also put in jeopardy the ability for us to support our family with our small business.

I urge you to OPPOSE HB137

Sincerely,

Lance Kronberger

[REDACTED]

Eagle River, AK 99577

[REDACTED]

Elle Ahkivgak

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 12:26 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB137 Comments - Nate Turner
Attachments: HB137 Comments - Nate Turner.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Veronica Brost [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 5:10 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: HB-137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am opposed to HB-137. Further reduction of non-resident tags would greatly reduce income for many communities in Alaska. The economic trickle down effect would potentially be in the tens of millions of dollars. Alaska resident hunters already have access to hunting opportunities unmatched almost anywhere in the world, especially in the USA. Most other places residents have to pay for the privilege to hunt big game. Here in Alaska, we as residents have vast opportunities without even buying tags. We can obtain harvest tickets to hunt many species without any cost in many areas. By further limiting non residents the opportunity to hunt or reducing their quota of drawing tags in many areas will cripple some guide businesses. It would also seem to establish a dangerous precedence for other user groups to obtain the same no competition venue. Maybe we should also limit amount of non-resident fishermen in certain areas or limit amount of non-resident tourists to certain areas, etc. As an Alaska resident, I am willing to compete with non-resident hunters.

Thank You,
Wayne and Veronica Brost

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 2:28 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: Opposition to HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

My name is Dennis Zadra and I have operated my guiding business, Lonesome Dove Outfitters, out of Cordova for 25 years. If HB 137 were to pass, it would be devastating to my business and to the Alaska Guiding Industry. I employ up to 12 guides and packers every year who are all Alaska residents. Granted, this is short term contract employment, but they all love the opportunity to be part of this industry and to get away from their regular jobs. The only way to implement this Bill is to mandate drawing hunts to any area or species in which it is determined that resident opportunity is unsatisfied. Currently, less than 50% of the draw tags awarded in this State ever get utilized. The Board of Game has plenty of tools to limit non-resident opportunity when they see fit. Our local moose areas have been closed to non-resident hunting for as long as I can remember.

This issue is being pushed by a small group of Elites, Resident Hunters of Alaska, who simply want to kick the guides out of the areas they hunt. All Alaskans have ample hunting opportunity with the current system, and ADF&G does an excellent job of managing the wildlife resource. HB 137 would be very financially burdensome to the State with it's implementation and equally detrimental to the loss of revenue that the sport guiding industry brings to the State.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my point of view and please include it in the public record.

Sincerely,

Dennis M. Zadra

Lonesome Dove Outfitters ,Inc.

From: Edward Toribio [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 12:29 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: OPPOSITION TO HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Representative(s),

I am writing to you to express my deep concern and opposition to HB 137. I grew up in Oregon and first came to Alaska in 1982, working as a seasonal employee for the Forest Service. After completing my Bachelor's degree in Forest Engineering at Oregon State University, I moved to Ketchikan to establish permanent residency in 1986. I continued to work in timber for a native corporation. As the timber industry grew soft, I looked for another career that would allow me to continue working in the beautiful Alaska outdoors. I chose the guide industry and have been fortunate to see many parts of the state while working as a hunting and fishing guide.

I have been a registered hunting guide since 1997 and now hold a Master Guide License. My business is based in Ketchikan. Between hunting seasons I work as a fishing and ecotour guide. As you might imagine, being able to provide ecotours helps take some of the pressure off of the somewhat fragile fisheries resource. Still, the majority of my income comes from taking non-resident hunters on guided trips, in the spring for brown bear and black bear and in the fall, for mountain goat.

I am fortunate that the game populations in the Ketchikan area are healthy and feel only light to moderate hunting pressure compared to other places I have hunted. I am also very fortunate that the dramatic beauty of Misty Fiords National Monument draws non-resident clients to hire me as their guide in pursuit of their dream hunt. If the non-resident hunters were imposed with a mandatory drawing permit hunt for the species that I guide, with a maximum of 10% non-resident permits of the total available quota, it would have a severe negative impact on my ability to procure enough hunters to keep my business running.


Nearly all of my income gets spent here in the State, either directly to the State of Alaska, or to the many vendors and residents of Alaska who provide the services that I depend on to keep my clients safe, happy and successful on their Alaska dream hunt. In addition, my non-resident clients spend a considerable amount of money in the State of Alaska in pursuit of these wonderful experiences. Non-resident clients who hire guides are committed to the having successful wildlife management and healthy game populations and are willing to pay higher prices for licenses and tags.

By imposing a mandatory drawing permit, the State would stand to lose valuable funds that are normally dedicated to conservation. The loss of these funds, reducing the State's ability to manage wildlife resources, could result in resident hunters losing more opportunity than they would by sharing the field with non-residents.

It is my opinion that the Board of Game already has adequate tools to ensure that resident hunting opportunity is being reasonably satisfied. They can limit the non-resident season, limit methods and means, have selective closures of non-resident hunts, and they may impose controlled use areas where needed. I feel that the law that is currently in place is adequate. Please consider these many factors when it is time to vote on HB 137 and **please do not pass this bill**.

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Edward Toribio
Master Guide #196

Ketchikan, AK 99901

Elle Ahkivgak

From: Henry D. Tiffany IV [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 12:13 PM
To: House Resources
Subject: Strong Opposition to HB 137

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear House Resources Committee,

Below, please find my letter of strong opposition to HB 137. I'm sending it to you so that it can be included in the public record for the bill.

Sincerely,

Henry Tiffany

Sent from my smartphone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Henry D. Tiffany IV" [REDACTED]
Date: February 17, 2020 at 8:39:27 AM GMT
To: rep.chris.tuck@akleg.gov, rep.john.lincoln@akleg.gov, rep.geran.tarr@akleg.gov, Representative.David.Talerico@akleg.gov, Representative.Grier.Hopkins@akleg.gov, Representative.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov, Representative.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov, Representative.Sara.Rasmussen@akleg.gov, Representative.Ivy.Spohnholz@akleg.gov
Subject: Strong Opposition to HB 137

Dear Representatives,

I am out of the country with my family of six on a much anticipated trip made possible through the generosity of a family members gift to us but I am so strongly opposed to HB 137 that, with only a phone at my disposal to communicate, I am taking the time to write you and share my feelings.

I am a proud, life long Alaskan who, as I quickly approach my 50th year in Alaska, has hunted and enjoyed the bounty of our splendid natural resources my entire life.

To speak plainly, this ongoing quest of entitlement by a small but vocal special interest group within our state really needs to end as it is not in the states, the people's, the natural resources nor the states best interests. They desire the almost exclusivity of our natural big game resources but appear not to understand or appreciate the severe ramifications of their desires.

The estimated loss of revenue to the Star of Alaska Division of Wildlife will be between \$5-\$25 million annually. Real costs to the state extend far beyond the impacts to state revenue. The private sector guiding community will lose, at a minimum, half of its total output. This will remove \$25-\$30 million NEW dollars to the state economy each year. Approximately 1,000 Alaskan jobs will be lost and economic impacts in rural Alaska will be devastating if a permitted hunt system is implemented across the state but especially on state land areas without concessions.

HB 137 will eliminate significant streams of financial resources for Conservation, which affects resident opportunity much MORE than sharing the field with non-resident hunters. I believe I am correct when I say that statewide, resident hunters harvest far more big game animals annually than do non-resident hunters; the resident success rate may be lower but that does not detract from the fact that currently resident hunters harvest more animals than do visiting non-resident hunters.

It would seem that “reasonable resident opportunity” is impossible to define and that the Board of Game already has effective and adequate tools to ensure resident opportunity is met. The Board of Game already has, within its arsenal, the means by which to limit non-resident hunting seasons, limit methods and means, selective closures of non-resident hunts, and controlled use areas, for example.

Passage of HB 137 will have severe financial impacts on our state economy and on many families within Alaska, such as mine, that derive their income from the honor of guiding non-resident hunters on big game hunts within Alaska.

HB 137 will have the significant destabilizing impact of drawing hunts, which is the ability to sell hunts for the highest value, which due to the trickle down effect, will have severe negative financial impacts on many Alaskans and their businesses.

Our non-resident client’s commitments to the success of Alaskan wildlife management and willingness to pay high license and tag fees is of great value to the State of Alaska and our sound game management and stewardship.

Myself, my family and the many Alaskan guides that I work with and the many Alaskan business that we help to support through guiding non-resident hunters will all be severely, negatively effected by the passage of HB 137 and I very strongly encourage you to oppose HB 137.

Respectfully,

Henry D. Tiffany IV
Chairman, State of Alaska Big Game Commercial Services Board
Master Guide and Outfitter
Fairbanks, Alaska

Sent from my smartphone