

Thank you for the opportunity to get on the record.

My name is Mike McCrary.

Friday night my testimony was:

****I am opposed to the concept of a working group. I'll add that I have not been able to find a statute that authorizes the BOG to establish a working group for the expressed purpose of advising the BOG on sheep management. When we are in the field you expect us to follow the laws you have established. If something is not expressly authorized in the law then the assumption is it's expressly prohibited by the law. I believe working groups like the one proposed by the BOG and appointed by the BOG may be unauthorized.**

****I am in favor of the department evaluating existing sheep management plans.**

**** The last couple days we have all heard many people reference constitutional mandates that put residents first. Friday night I suggested the BOG develop a specific resident allocation policy that would guide the Board going forward. You know..make clear exactly where residents stand with regard to allocation of opportunity when any season or bag limit is going to be reduced. That would be good for everyone.**

****And I said Friday night I supported proposal 111.**

In the last couple of days we also heard testimony related to the Alaska Professional Hunters Associations failed attempt to get a GCP through the public process.

The proposed GCP required a million dollars in public funds to implement and \$300K a year in public funds to manage. In two years GCP did not even come close to passing the legislature when oil was 120 dollars a barrel.

So it is pretty certain now the BOG will take all the heat related to limiting guides which it appears now can only be accomplished through the BOG process of limiting non residents.

Clearly, the BGCSB is still obligated to limit the activity of guides but failed to participate rationally; as a good partner to the BOG's management process, when it comes to limiting the activity of guides.

For the last 30 years the BGCSB has been on a path that un-limited the activity of guides and the BOG; as far as I know, has done next to nothing to help the BGCSB reset that course of action. So there is a related management failure on the part of the BOG too.

Many people; including the BOG delegate on the BGCSB, could identify many ways in which the BGCSB could limit the activity of guides independently. Without BOG generated proposals. Without working groups. Without million dollar subsidies. Without impacting resident hunting opportunity.

But, the BOG still has a seat at the BGCSB table and Mr Spraker has a bully pulpit so I suppose it is not too late to address the failure of the BGCSB's obligation to work in partnership with the BOG and limit the activity of guides. You know...a version the two Boards sharing the burden. That I believe is where shared burden should start and where it should end.

But, when the BOG considers limits on non residents there seems to be some kind of

notion swirling around that.....residents are somehow obligated to take a hit too. That notion undermines the constitutional mandate of managing for residents first...that is if you believe in constitutional mandates.

My final comments are related to Federal concessions.

First, guides who own federal concessions contracts should not be granted some sort of BOG enabled "entitlement" to harvest state resources.

Proposals that come before the BOG; or even discussions, regarding guides who control federal areas being entitled to an "allocation pass" if it comes down to a reduction in non resident opportunity are not entitled to a special privilege and grant compared to guides who do not have a federal concession.

Another point I want to make about Federal Areas.

Guides tell the Federal agencies what species and how many opportunities they intend to sell each year for the duration of the contracts. 10 year contracts.

No limits and no formal biological factors are provided or evaluated by any agency specific to the guide proposals for an award of a concessions contracts.

We hear the term 'shared burden' tossed around quite a bit so when it comes down to having to reduce non resident opportunity should not that decision affect a guide who operates on Federal lands the same as it does a guide who operates on state land?

Where is the shared burden when guides with a federal areas can jump between state land and federal lands but a guides who do not have a federal area can only operate on state land?

It is possible federal concessions could be contributing to management problems?

I think so. And I think BOG members should open their minds to that possibility.

In closing:

The BOG asked us the audience to respond to two questions Friday night.

There are two questions I believe a lot of us Alaskans have for the Board of game.

The first question is:

When changes are necessary that result in reduced opportunity...WHY won't the BOG support just limiting non residents first...see how that goes without also compromising resident opportunity right off the bat?

Second Question is:

Is the BOG opposed to bringing the BGCSB into its management arena?

I hope some of the Board members will remember to reflect on these questions when you begin deliberating proposals that would result in any reduced opportunity.

Thank you. J