

March 18, 2016
Mike McCrary

RC 039

RC _____

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of myself.

Thursday at the work session BLM briefed the BOG on a concept of BLM limiting guided hunting on BLM lands.

About the first thing that came out of the BLM briefing presented to this Board revealed a question of whether or not BLM has the authority; law and regulation, to somehow "limit" the activity of guiding on BLM lands.

To answer that very important question BLM requested their Inspector General staff provide a legal opinion on BLM's authority to "limit" guides.

The IG is going to tell BLM that there is no BLM specific legal frame work in place to competitively select what guide gets to provide guided services on BLM land.

If Mr. Spraker is going to be allowed to lead this Board down the road of ramping up; again, support for the concept of 'concessions' on state land this Board should; like BLM leadership has done, request the AG office provide the Board with DNR's specific statutory authority to implement any competitive process that would determine what guide gets to provide guide services on state land.

I am certain DNR has no authority to implement "concessions" contracts. State Parks does. DNR does not.

DNR does have the authority to permit use of state land. But, DNR has no authority to offer "competitive" permits.

DNR has the authority to implement "competitive" commercial land leases. But commercial use of lands will not be limited to only "bidders" who hold a 'guide' license.

During the Boards short discussion related to BLM's briefing Mr. Spraker essentially made the statement that himself and Board member Turner are in "lock step" on the idea that DNR's GCP; a scheme invented by the Alaska Professional Hunters Association intended to further subsidize the commercial hunting industry, essentially will solve all the BOG's problems.

Many people; myself included, certainly appreciate one board member for speaking up and reminding everyone; including BLM, that there is no consensus on the idea that GCP is the solution to crowding and over harvest by non residents of Alaskans game and in cautioning BLM from walking away from their briefing to the BOG with the misconception that there is consensus from the BOG that schemes to limit the numbers of guides is a legitimate; public interest, solution.

The BLM briefing being essentially unannounced was an obvious set-up by Mr. Spraker and Mr. Turner. BLM was brought to the work session to back Mr. Spraker and Member Turner's play. Mr. Spraker is boldly driving the rest of you; for the most part, to once again stall the process of dealing with proposals that would limit non resident hunters.

How the BOG gets to taking a "position" and taking positions on such guide limiting schemes without allowing the public to participate and/or blindsiding the public; like Mr. Spraker and Turner did on Thursday, are great examples of why there are trust issues with the BOG's processes.

The answer to problems of dealing with allocation and crowding is for the Board of Game to deal with allocation and crowding. Not BLM. Not NPS. Not USFW and not DNR.

I should not have to tell you board members this....but DNR does not manage hunters. It manages land. BLM does not manage hunters. It manages land. The NPS and USFW do not manage hunters. They manage land.

If members of the BOG want to manage guides put an application to Boards and Commissions...I know you know how to do that. Get yourself appointed to the Big Game Commercial Services Board while there still is a Big Game Commercial Services Board.

But if the BOG wants to be in the business of limiting guides then...limit non resident hunters. That is your business. Managing hunters.

To do that you may have to get down and get dirty and take the BOG back from Mr. Spraker and Mr. Turner's manipulations of the process.

In any case, returning Board of Game representation back to the AC's and the resident hunters of Alaska is going to happen sooner than later.

Mike McCrary
mccrary907@gmail.com