

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
 DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING

BIG GAME COMMERCIAL SERVICES BOARD

CONDENSED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD MARCH 28-30, 2023

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of the Big Game Commercial Services Board was held March 28-30, 2023, at Pike’s Waterfront Lodge, 1850 Hoselton Rd., Fairbanks, Ak.

Dates:	March 28-30, 2023
Time:	March 28: 9:00 a.m. (9:01 a.m.); March 29: 9:00 a.m. (9:01 a.m.); March 30: 9:00 a.m. (9:03 a.m.)
Location:	Pike’s Waterfront Lodge: 1850 Hoselton Rd., Fairbanks, Ak
Board Members Present:	Jason Bunch, Aaron Bloomquist, Jerry Burnett, Martin Boniek, Mike Flores, Clay Nordlum, Pete Buist (days two and three)
Board Members Absent:	Aaron Bloomquist (day two: Excused at 3:22 p.m.; day 3: Excused until 11:17 a.m.), Jerry Burnett (day two: excused until 2:00 p.m.), Pete Buist (day one: Excused), Mike Flores (day three: Excused), Larry Kunder (excused for entire meeting)
Division/SOA Staff Present:	Thomas Bay (Executive Administrator), Janet Brown (Occupational Licensing Examiner), Lee Strout (Investigator) Megyn Weigand (Senior Assistant Attorney General), Alison Osborne (Regulation Specialist), Melissa Dumas (Administrative Operations Manager), Sylvan Robb (Division Director), Glenn Saviers (Deputy Director), Mandy Bonefeld (Legislative Auditor)
Present from the Public (all three days):	Dianna Leinberger (DNR), Jim Wessel (DNR), AJ Michaels (DNR), Jason Anderson (USFS), Zach Million (BLM), Cody Smith (USFWS), Virgil Umphenour, Wayne Kubat, Al Barrette, Austin Atkinson, James Smith, Michelle Heun, “Smokey” Don Duncan, Tim Booch, Zach Decker, Josh Ellis, Justin Horton, Mike Zweng, Michael Sciotti, Cabot Pitts, Dan Montgomery, Deborah Moore, Rob Jones, Zach Basmajian, Cole Hendrickson, Bill Kaltschnee, Dan Valentine, Gabe Davis, Jason Semler, Phil Byrd, Nate Turner, Mark Richards, Coke Wallace, Steve Perrins, 1(907)538-1368, 1(979)820-9169, 1(907)252-4090, 1(907)355-4822, 1(631)678-7743, 1(907)390-0048

Day One		
1. Review Agenda		
Brief Discussion:	No discussion to amend the agenda.	
Motion:	Move to accept the agenda as written (First: Flores; Second: Nordlum).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Absent	Burnett – Absent (arrived at 9:07 a.m.)
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
2. Ethics Review		

Brief Discussion:	There were no ethical disclosures by any board members or staff.	
3. Review/Approve Meeting Minutes:		
Brief Discussion: -December 2022 -February 2023	Mr. Bay informed the board that he had been extremely busy with competing priorities and their December 2022 meeting minutes were still in process. He informed the board that the meeting minutes from their short meeting in February 2023 were finished, which the board reviewed.	
Motion:	Move to accept the February minutes as written (First: Flores; Second: Nordlum).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Absent (excused)	Burnett - Absent
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
4. State & Federal Agency Updates		
Brief Discussion: -Department of Natural Resources -Division of Mining, Land and Water	<p>Dianna Leinberger, a natural resource land manager, in the Northern region, from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Division of Mining, Land and Water (DMLW), was in attendance to provide an update for the board. She introduced Jim Wessel, the primary adjudicator for permits for guide-outfitters, transporters, and trapping cabin permits in the Northern region. She also introduced AJ Michaels, a new land manager on the permits and easements team for DMLW. Ms. Leinberger said that most guides/transporters understand DMLW's framework process very well, but that she understands that it is creating frustration for some. She informed the board that they are committed to partnering with the industry to find solutions to resolve conflict in the field by professional guides/transporters to the extent that they can do it through permitting. While eliminating a type of permit or instituting buffers between camps might work in reducing some user conflict in the field, it is unlikely that alone will accomplish it. She said that they have to work within the framework of the constitution and the statutes created by the legislature, and that they cannot operate outside their authority. She said that she believes that they need to get at the fundamental issues causing conflict, that they understand that the issues directly impact the livelihoods of guides/transporters, and that they are critically important. While they are committed to working on solutions, She said that it will take a coordinated effort between ADF&G, DNR, DCCED, the Big Game Commercial Services Board (BGCSB), and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) to find effective solutions to reduce conflict, address conflict issues, and maintain a world-class professional hunting industry in Alaska. She informed the board that DNR field presence, in the Northern region, would be increasing to ensure compliance or address compliance issues. She reminded the board that DNR does not have enforcement authority and that they have to rely on guides/transporters to conduct themselves with professionalism and integrity. She said that when guides/transporters do not obtain the authorizations they need for the use of state land or adhere to the terms of their authorizations, they will work closely with AWT, the BGCSB, and DCCED to address noncompliance. To be clear, she said that their goal is always compliance, that they will continue to authorize the activity if the user is compliant, and that they do not dispense penalties or punishment. In closing, she reiterated that the</p>	

answers to issues on state land are not simple and that it will take a coordinated effort, and that they are committed to working together with everybody as professionals to find solutions. Chairman Bunch thanked Ms. Leinberger for the update and informed everybody in attendance that DNR was working with the Guide Concessions Program workgroup, that they have been very helpful, and that they have the right people in the right positions to create solutions to issues on state land. Mr. Flores asked Ms. Leinberger how many acres they covered in the Northern region, to which she said that, while she was not exactly sure, there was about 60 million acres. He asked her how they hear about conflicts in the field, to which she said that it depended on the conflict, and that this is where people get frustrated, and it gets complicated. She said that DNR is only allowed to work on issues directly related to their authorizations under AS 38.05.850, which allows them to issue permits for commercial use of state land. She said that if they hear about conflicts that they do not have authority to enforce, they contact who does, such as ADF&G for Title IX offenses, and AWT, for criminal offenses. On the flip side, she said that they are contacted for questions about authorizations on state land from the enforcement authority. Mr. Flores asked if there had been an increase with conflicts in the field recently, to which she said no, but there had been an increase in noncompliance. She said that this is where frustration with guides/transporters comes in. They get frustrated because some guides/transporters go years without an authorization and, when they get caught, they simply have to get authorizations moving forward, and do not receive punishment because DNR does not have enforcement authority to enforce noncompliance. The Board's investigator, Lee Strout, said that it is difficult for the board to enforce noncompliance from their licensees, related to authorization on state land, because of DNR's inability to enforce noncompliance. However, he said that the board has gone after some licensees in the past, as it relates to nonpayment of permit fees. Ms. Leinberger said that, while they can work with AWT for criminal trespass, AWT is often very busy with their own job of hunting enforcement. She said that it is rare that AWT issues a citation for criminal trespass and the AG's Office has wanted to take it on. Chairman Bunch said that the board is aware of licensees having issues with how DNR deals with noncompliance, that it is on their radar, and that their good relationship with DNR should provide for some type of solution in the future. He asked Ms. Leinberger if she was willing to speak on some topics/issues that had been brought up from licensees, to which she said yes. He informed her that a licensee would like to eliminate the no cause revocation clause that DNR applies to all commercial recreation permits (CRPs) and asked her thoughts. She said that, although the CRPs are revocable, she did not remember revoking a single one in her 17 years with DNR. She said that she thought the issue revolved more about having interest in the land rather than the policy itself, and that someone that wanted more infrastructure with their camps should look into getting a lease instead of a CRP because CRPs are supposed to be short-term whereas leases are supposed to be long-term. He asked about the possibility of requiring a latitude/longitude GPS in township-range location that would apply to the maximum of two spike camps that are currently allowed under a CRP. She said that DNR has not required them because guides do not know where they are going to be while in the field. Mr. Bloomquist asked her where DNR was at with guide permitting in regard to bear baiting, as he had received different answers over the years. She said that bear baiting could be included in the terms of a CRP if it was for commercial use. He asked her about bear baiting with clients who stay on private property without a CRP and it only

	<p>being for day-use, to which she said that you would need day-use registration. She said that the confusion comes in when a bear baiting station stays on state land for more than 14 days, which requires land use authorization. She said that there had been frustration in the past over inconsistencies between the different regions that DNR oversees, and that a permit policy team was created to ensure everybody was on the same page. He asked what the fees were going to be for bear baiting permits, to which she said she was unsure. However, she informed the board that DNR had recently received approval for providing over-the-counter storage permits, which would allow guides to keep their bear baiting equipment in the field outside of the season. Chairman Bunch asked her if she thought that guides, who have traditionally used land use permits (LUPs) for their business, need leases. She said that there are certain operations that would benefit from a lease because their camps have grown over time and would not be able to be removed within 48 hours, a requirement of an LUP. She said there are two types of leases. One is a noncompetitive, short-term lease for 10 years or less, which can be renewed for another 10 years, and one is competitive, a long-term lease for 10 years or longer. The competitive lease, she said, has the benefit of being eligible, at the end of your lease, to submit for a preference rights sale, which is to purchase the land from the state. With nothing left to discuss, the board thanked Ms. Leinberger for her time and moved onto the next agency update.</p>
<p>-U.S. Forest Service</p>	<p>Jason Anderson, a recreation supervisor for the United States Forest Service (USFS), was in attendance to provide an update for the USFS. Mr. Anderson informed the board that USFS was planning on doing an advertisement for a big game hunting prospectus in 2023, and that they were working with the state to identify the potential for new guided hunt opportunities for big game species across the forest. He said that they anticipated sending a letter out in the Spring (2023) to all existing USFS big game hunting permit holders, to give them a heads up about the prospectus, so they could provide feedback on the potential complications for offering additional guided hunt opportunities on public lands. Based on that feedback, he said, they would hopefully have the prospectus ready by June or early July (2023). Chairman Bunch asked if they were anticipating all forest or just specific areas for the prospectus, to which he said it would be the Tongass National Rainforest. Mr. Anderson reminded the board that they had been working with big game guides and tourism operators on small to medium vessels that work in the same area, to reduce conflict in the field and operate effectively. He informed the board that, after speaking with smaller cruise lines, there is a lot of demand/traffic for Southeast Alaska. Something related, he said, was the Southeast Alaska Sustainable Strategy, an initiative launched by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a few years ago to emphasize the economic well-being of Southeast Alaska in context of how the USFS is managing public lands, putting a lot of emphasis on economic areas such as tribal relations to deliver various economic benefits in and around the region. He said that various partners of the organization were able to apply for funds through that sustainability strategy. One specific funding source he was working with was the Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC), with a goal to reengage the Visitor Products Cluster Working Group. He said that they found a variety of sectors affecting the broader recreation and tourism industry, one being the demand for smaller cruise lines. He said that, through past experiences, there is an importance of keeping an open conversation between the guide-outfitter community and the tourism industry. He informed the board that there were discussions about building a recreation summit in Fall 2023, after the tour season is over and most of the</p>

	<p>hunting season is over, to have a current check-in with all recreation providers across all business sectors, in regard to where they see the region heading. He said that, although the JEDC is running it, it would be important for the big game guiding community to be aware of it and to participate in it as they can. Chairman Bunch said that he knew that guides in Southeast Alaska are going to want to be involved in the recreation summit and asked Mr. Anderson if they would be doing their own outreach, to which he said yes, that they would be reaching out directly to their permit holders because they are an important piece of the broader regional economy attached to recreation. Mr. Bunch asked him if there were any issues with transporters and guides in Southeast Alaska, to which he said there were none that he could think of. With nothing left to discuss, the board moved onto the next agency update.</p>
<p>-U.S. Department of the Interior -Bureau of Land Management</p>	<p>Zach Million, Program Lead for recreation for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for Alaska, was in attendance to provide an update for the BLM. Mr. Million said that the BLM oversees approximately 70 million acres that are split between three districts and five field offices. He said that they currently have 133 Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) statewide, and that approximately 1/3 of them are for commercial hunting. He informed the board that there was no change in their fee structure, but that there would likely be a slight change in their base fee for an SRP, going from \$115 a year to \$120 (not counting the 3 percent of gross receipts after \$3,800 of income). He reminded the board that the BLM had created the Recreation Application Permitting Tracking and Online Reporting (RAPTOR) system, a new online system that all of the BLM offices in the nation were transitioning to, in order to streamline the application process. He said that one of their offices would transition in 2023 and that all offices nationwide should be finished transitioning by 2026. Chairman Bunch asked if the BLM has had any issues or foresee any issues with RAPTOR, as it relates to older guides using their system that may not be tech savvy. He said that there has been a lot of latitude with applicants and that they are working with all applicants. He said that the real force behind the online applications is a mandate that BLM has to abide by, which is to convert all of their paper records to digital records. He informed the board that there would be some considerable Department of Transportation highway construction along the Richardson Highway and some popular areas, which will lead to delays. For the Eastern Interior office, he said that they had completed a travel management plan to primarily affect the Steese National Conservation Area, which includes new off-highway vehicle regulations, one being a weight restriction in regard to summer vehicles. With nothing left to discuss, the board moved onto the next agency update.</p>
<p>-Board of Game</p>	<p>Jerry Burnett, the designated Board of Game (BOG) representative on the board, provided an update for the BOG. He thanked board members Aaron Bloomquist and Mike Flores for attending their recent BOG meeting. He said that Aaron had testified in regard to the state's Guide Concession Program (GCP), and that, although the BOG seemed supportive, they need more details as the program moves forward. He said that the BOG took action on a few items that affect transporters and guides. He said that they reduced the nonresident deer limits in units 4 and 8 because they received a lot of testimony and public comment in regard to how many transporters were in the area and the fact that a lot of nonresident hunters do not take the meat home after a successful hunt. He said that the BOG also decided to close the 19C area to nonresident sheep hunting, starting in 2023, because of the depletion of sheep in the area. With the topic being very controversial, he</p>

	<p>informed the board that there should be discussion on it when they meet in the Fall. He said that the BOG is planning on meeting in Kotzebue and Fairbanks in 2024. Lastly, he informed the board that they did not make any changes to the bear management plans for Southeast Alaska or Kodiak. Chairman Bunch said that, as a resident of Kodiak (not as a board member), the community had been looking to the BOG for ways to limit transporters in the area. He thanked the BOG for listening to the surrounding villages and residents of Kodiak. He also said that he does not think that the issue with unit 19 should be a BGCSB issue, but instead be something that the BOG and ADF&G deals with together. With nothing left to discuss, the board moved onto the next agency update.</p>
<p>-U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</p>	<p>Cody Smith, a Senior Federal Wildlife Officer from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), was in attendance to provide an update for the USFWS. He informed the board that he would not be able to answer any questions about permitting, but that he was able to speak to the law enforcement side of things, as it relates to USFWS. He said that the USFWS is increasing their numbers statewide, so guides/transporters might be seeing new officers in the field that might not have a full grasp on the statutes and regulations. He said he had talked to multiple people over the past year that were uncomfortable/hesitant with reporting violations in the field and wanted everybody to know that the USFWS has a 100 percent anonymous tip hotline for reporting violations. For those who operate on national wildlife refuges, he asked that they get to know who their local federal wildlife officer is and report nonemergent incidents to them because they have reporting and tracking requirements in the refuges. Chairman Bunch asked if the USFWS had any helicopters at their disposal, to which officer Smith said they did not, but that they should have one in 2024. Chairman Bunch informed him that guides are already having issues with helicopters hindering hunting operations in the field and warned him that additional helicopters probably would not go over well with the guide industry. However, he noted that if helicopters are used with discretion, there were instances that made sense, such as using a helicopter to get to an area that a fixed wing plane could not. Officer Smith said that, while they are likely to get a helicopter in the future, most of their flights should be by fixed wing planes, only using helicopters when needed. With no other agency left to provide an update, the board went to lunch.</p>
<p>5. Lunch Off Record: 11:03 a.m.</p>	
<p>6. Prioritize Current Regulation Projects</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion: On Record: 1:02 p.m.</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch informed everybody in attendance that they added a slot on the agenda to prioritize their current regulation projects in an attempt to prioritize important regulation projects that needed to be addressed sooner than later. Mr. Bay informed the board that Alison Osborne, one of the division's regulation specialists, was in attendance. Ms. Osborne introduced herself. She informed the board that the regulation process had changed since their last meeting, and that the Department of Law (LAW) would review regulation projects before they go out for public notice. The board informed her that they had a lot of regulation changes that they were trying to accomplish and asked if it would be faster if they broke them into two regulation projects instead of one, to which she said yes, especially if they were time-sensitive. The board gave her an overview of the regulation projects they discussed at their last meeting. During the overview, Chairman Bunch informed the board that there was an issue with 12 AAC 75.260(d) in regard to providing</p>

<p>Off Record: 2:21 p.m.</p>	<p>unique verification codes (UVCs) and that they could amend their current regulation project, which includes the same regulation, to address it. He said the issue was with the language, "Unique verification codes will only be issued to registered or master guides who are in a guide use area located in the hunt area the year the application is made and the years the permit is valid," and undersubscribed hunts, which are tags that nobody applied for, for the December 15th deadline, and become available on a first-come first-serve basis through ADF&G through a second application process. He explained that the second application process was new to the board and the intention of their regulation never meant to allow for additional UVC codes to be provided for a second application deadline for the same hunts as the original December deadline. Unfortunately, with the current language, the board is required to provide UVC codes for the second application deadline. After updating Ms. Osborne on their regulation projects, Chairman Bunch informed the board that the division was working on a sort of checklist/spreadsheet called, "Prioritization Framework," for boards to get their ideas in order and prioritize what is most important, and that they would be using it the next day of the meeting to prioritize their most important regulation projects. Having nothing left to discuss, the board decided to take a break before moving onto the probation monitor report.</p>
<p>7. Investigations Unit/Tabled Applications</p>	
<p>Probation Monitor Report</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion: On Record: 2:33 p.m.</p>	<p>Back from break, the board began discussion on their probation monitor report. Investigator Lee Strout was in attendance to provide the report for the probation monitor. Mr. Strout informed the board that there were currently 22 licensees on probation, as of the date of the report, and that zero licensees were released from probation since the last report. He informed the board that both Shawn Huffman, a master guide-outfitter who is on probation, and Gilbert Huntington, a registered guide-outfitter who is on probation, had not yet made any payments on their fines, with both of their first payments supposed to have been paid by February 12, 2023, and that the probation monitor was in the process of contacting both of them. Mr. Strout updated the board on John Walker's, a master guide-outfitter, suspension. He reminded the board that Mr. Walker had been on probation and non-compliant with his fines since January 22, 2021, and that the division, after numerous attempts to contact him, put his license in suspended status on July 23, 2021. Mr. Walker was finally served by the Alaska State Troopers (AST) on January 7, 2022, where he reported that he does not intend to guide in the future. The division, Mr. Strout said, was in communication with the AST to serve Mr. Walker with a voluntary surrender of license, and that there would be more information on it in the future. With nothing left to discuss, the board moved onto their investigative report.</p>
<p>Investigative Report</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion: Off Record: 2:59 p.m.</p>	<p>The board's investigator, Lee Strout, provided the board with their investigative report, which was for the period of November 22, 2022, thru March 14, 2023. He informed the board that there were currently 48 open cases and 24 that closed since their last report. With nothing left to discuss for the investigative report, the board took a break before entering into executive session to discuss confidential investigative matters.</p>
<p>Executive Session</p>	

Brief Discussion: On Record: 3:17 p.m.	Returning from break, the board decided to go into executive session to review confidential investigative matters.	
Motion: Off Record: 3:18 p.m.	I, Martin Boniek, move that the Alaska State Big Game Commercial Services Board enter into executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c), and Alaska Constitutional Right to Privacy Provisions, for the purpose of discussing subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion; and matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential. Board staff Thomas Bay, Janet Brown, and Lee Strout, and legislative auditor Mandy Bonefeld to remain during the session (First: Boniek; Second: Flores).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Absent (excused)	Burnett -Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder – Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Brief Discussion: On Record: 3:47 p.m.	No action was taken during executive session. The board left executive session to go back on the record and have Senior Assistant Attorney General Megyn Weigand join them for a confidential discussion regarding an application.	
Motion: Off Record: 3:49 p.m.	I, Martin Boniek, move that the Alaska State Big Game Commercial Services Board enter into executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c), and Alaska Constitutional Right to Privacy Provisions, for the purpose of discussing subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion; and matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential. Board staff Thomas Bay, Janet Brown, and Lee Strout, legislative auditor Mandy Bonefeld, and Senior Assistant Attorney General Megyn Weigand to remain during the session (First: Boniek; Second: Flores).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Absent (excused)	Burnett -Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder – Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Brief Discussion: On Record: 4:03 p.m. Off Record: 4:04 p.m.	No action was taken during executive session. With nothing left to discuss for the day, the board recessed until the next morning.	
Day Two		
1. Review Agenda		
Brief Discussion:	After discussion, the board decided to amend the agenda by adding a “transporter stickers” discussion under “Regulation Proposals – New Proposals” on the agenda.	
Motion:	Move to accept the agenda as amended (First: Boniek; Second: Flores).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Absent (excused, arrived at 2 p.m.)

	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
2. Summary/Motions from Executive Session		
Brief Discussion:	Chairman Bunch informed the audience that the board would be voting on investigative matters that were discussed in executive session at the end of day one.	
Case No. 2020-001017		
Brief Discussion:	The board considered the surrender of license for Case No. 2020-001017. Licensee requested to surrender his license instead of agree to a consent agreement and the stipulations that would come with it. There was no discussion.	
Motion:	Move to accept the surrender of license for Case No. 2020-001017 (First: Boniek; Second: Flores).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Abstain	Burnett - Absent (excused)
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Case No. 2022-001194		
Brief Discussion:	The board considered an assistant guide application for licensure for Case No. 2022-001194. Chairman Bunch said that the application was for an applicant who was in the middle of dealing with pending charges in court and could not, at the time, be in possession of a firearm, which is a direct conflict with the boards statutes and regulations, including AS 08.54.720(a)(8)(A) and 12 AAC 75.340(b)(1), (c)(1), and (d)(2).	
Motion:	Move to approve an assistant guide application for licensure for Case No. 2022-001194 (First: Boniek; Second: Flores).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Abstain	Burnett - Absent (excused)
	Boniek - No	Flores - No
	Bloomquist - No	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - No	Nordlum - No
3. Public Comment		
Brief Discussion:	Being ahead of schedule, the board moved into public comment early at 9:10 a.m. Mr. Bay created a list of attendees that wanted to provide public comment. The board began public comment.	
Virgil Umphenour	Virgil Umphenour, a master guide-outfitter, suggested having additional board packets available for the public at the BGCSB meetings so they can review the regulation proposals that will be discussed during the meeting. He acknowledged that there is always one available, but that it is not enough on its own, as there needs to be enough for everyone.	

	<p>He said that the regulation proposals need to be sent out to all licensees prior to a board meeting, so they can be reviewed ahead of time. The board agreed with Mr. Umphenour, that there should be more available proposals readily available at the meetings and ensured him that there would be moving forward. The board also said that the regulation proposals, via the board packet, are available to the public on their website and to everybody who signs up for the ListServ. The board thanked Mr. Umphenour for his testimony.</p>
<p>Chris Zwolinski</p>	<p>Chris Zwolinski, a master guide-outfitter, advocated for what Chairman Bunch had said the previous day, that they need to pay attention to the resource, to the animals. He suggested that guides be limited on the animals they can take, as well as the number of clients a guide or transporter can take into the field. He said that there are guides out there that overbook clients, knowing that the resource is not available to all of them, because they can, and it makes them a lot of money, so they continue to do it. He said that guides are not going to limit themselves, so the board needs to figure out a solution to the problem. Mr. Bloomquist said that it is difficult to limit the resource because the board has no statutory authority to limit the number of animals a client of a guide can take. Mr. Zwolinski acknowledged the same thing and said that the main reason he brought it up was to begin a conversation on it, in hopes that the board could discuss the issue with the Board of Game, as they would be more likely to listen to the Big Game Commercial Services Board than a single guide. The board thanked Mr. Zwolinski for his testimony.</p>
<p>“Smokey” Don Duncan</p>	<p>“Smokey” Don Duncan, a retired master guide-outfitter, expressed his frustration with the BGCSB trying to pass a new supervision regulation, stating that he was on a previous committee years ago for the same topic, and that it did not work because a few influential people wanted the regulation drafted to their liking and did not care how it affected other people’s operations. He said that he kept hearing the word ‘conflict’ during the meeting when discussing issues in the field, and that the correct word to use is ‘competition,’ as guides are competing for the same areas. He addressed the board trying to accomplish a guide concessions program, saying that he knew why they were again attempting to limit guides in areas, that guides do not like to deal with other guides in ‘their’ area. He said the problem is that it is not ‘their’ area. He said that prior attempts to accomplish a guide concessions program have all failed because of the common use clause in the constitution. Mr. Duncan also expressed his frustration with the BGCSB over the years, including past boards, with overregulating and their disciplinary matrix, which, in his opinion, is much too steep. He used a paperwork violation as an example, stating that it could result in hundreds or thousands of dollars in fines. The board thanked Mr. Duncan for his testimony.</p>
<p>Tim Booch</p>	<p>Tim Booch, a master guide-outfitter, offered his insight on conflict resolution. He suggested the following changes to the DNR commercial land use permitting guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The elimination of the no cause revocation clause that applies to all of DNR’s current commercial recreation land use permits (CRPs). 2. The elimination of the one-year duration current CRP that does not require a LAT/LONG GPS or township in range location device and does not go to public comment prior to its use.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The elimination of the 14-day use period mandate that applies to all current recreation land use permits and specifies at that use period, that the camp be moved for a period of time before it can be redeployed. 4. The elimination of non-transferability clause for all CRPs. 5. The adoption and application of a spatial separation distancing stipulation of 5-10 miles between existing recreation land use permitted camps, whose permittees are in good standing, and any/all new land use permits. 6. Require a LAT/LONG GPS or township in range location device applied to the maximum of two spike camps that are currently allowed for CRP permitted base camps. <p>Chairman Bunch informed Mr. Booch that he had already began discussions with DNR on his suggested changes and that it would not fall off his radar. The board thanked Mr. Booch for his testimony.</p>
<p>Wayne Kubat</p> <p>Off Record: 10:18 a.m.</p>	<p>Wayne Kubat, a master guide-outfitter, said that he was disappointed with the recent supervision subcommittee, stating that the process fell way short with only one subcommittee meeting before a draft proposal was reviewed at the December 2021 meeting and further discussed at the March 2022 meeting, where it received significant public criticism specific to excessive communication mandates and concerns that it allowed assistant guides to be supervised at extreme distances. Despite the public concern, and without any further subcommittee meetings or discussion, a similar proposal showed up in the board packet for the December 2022 meeting, and the board approved it to move forward as a regulations project. Mr. Kubat said that the new proposal felt rushed and severely lacked wide industry support, something that other guides had voiced to him as well. He said that “In the field” and “physically present” are phrases that are heard often when the topic of supervision comes up, but there is little or no agreement on what they mean. He said that the current proposal is more complicated and confusing than what is currently in the regulations, and that they need to have statutes and regulations that are clear and easy to understand if they are read once or twice. He informed the board that he submitted two regulation proposals of his own and that he could answer any questions that the board had, when topic was discussed later in the day. He strongly encouraged the board to park the current supervision proposal and reengage the subcommittee to come up with a better proposal that has wide industry support. The board thanks Mr. Kubat for his testimony and took a break.</p>
<p>4. Workgroup Updates/Formation of New Committees/Workgroups</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion: On Record: 10:34 a.m.</p>	<p>Back from break, the board began discussion on current workgroups and the formation of new committees/workgroups.</p>
<p>Exams</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch said that the Game Management Unit (GMU) exams are a bit outdated because of updates to ADF&G’s hunting regulations being updated over the years, and that a workgroup was created to update them. He said that the workgroup discussed what type of questions are important to any GMU, realized that there are around 25 universal questions that apply to every GMU, and that each exam would be updated with the questions. He said that the change will be good for a multitude of reasons, one of which</p>

	<p>would be future boards having to update the exams, and that they would continue to update the exams, with the hope that they would be updated and ready for board review by the December 2023 meeting.</p> <p>Chairman Bunch said that the RGO exams also need revised. He said that they were looking at changing some of the format for the RGO exams, to make it easier to proctor them, but without simplifying them. There was no date provided for when the exam changes might be ready for board review.</p> <p>Chairman Bunch said that the workgroup was looking into statistics regarding assistant guide issues in the field, such as taking sublegal species, to see if an exam should be created, instead of only utilizing the jurisprudence questionnaire for licensure. Aaron Bloomquist said that he had not seen a lot of assistant guides getting in trouble and that he did not think it was an issue.</p> <p>Pete Buist said that it is important not only to know the answers to the questions on the exams, but to know where to find the source material for the answers because things change so often.</p>
--	---

Transporters

Brief Discussion:	Mike Flores said that there would be a new regulation proposal, introduced later in their meeting, to amend 12 AAC 75.400(a). TRANSPORTER ACTIVITY REPORT. , to get rid of items that are nonessential and to add essential items that are not currently on the transporter activity report form.
--------------------------	--

Supervision

Brief Discussion:	Aaron Bloomquist said that the reason he did not have a lot of meetings with the supervision workgroup, as mentioned earlier, was because the board had discussed the issue during board meetings at length, and, with competing priorities between many guides, it had not really moved anywhere. He said that it was time to send it out for public comment and get the public's opinion.
--------------------------	---

Concession Program Update

Brief Discussion:	Jason Bunch said that the guide concession workgroup had met a few times and were in the beginning stages of the process. He said that they were figuring out what did not work for the previous guide concession workgroup and why, stating that a lot of the groundwork had already been established. He said that, with all of the agencies (ADF&G, DNR, DCCED) in the workgroup working together, there was a sense of trust between everybody, and he felt positive about getting something done. Having nothing left to discuss, he said that the board would be going to lunch and that the first order of business when they returned would be discussion on new regulation proposals.
Off Record: 11:15 a.m.	

5. Regulation Proposals - New Proposals

Hunt Planners

Brief Discussion: On Record: 1:05 p.m.	Back from lunch, Chairman Bunch gave the floor to Larry Bartlett, a hunt planner who provided a regulation proposal for managing hunt planners. Mr. Bartlett thanked the board for being able to speak, provided some background on himself, what a hunt planner does,
---	--

and how the industry is doing now. He said that he started a self-publishing company to elbow his way into the hunting industry, created a how-to float hunting book, which put him on the map as somewhat of an expert in the field. He said that, as a hunt planner, he is slowly moving towards retirement because of self-imposed restrictions, high conservation ethics, and encroaching hunt planners. He said the problem with hunt planners is that there is no regulation, nothing besides self-restriction to prevent overbooking clients, which in turn creates overcrowding and overharvesting in the field. He said that if everyone was aware of how fast the moose areas in the state are getting swamped by hunt planners, without any regulation or conservation ethics, it would frighten them. He said that, as a hunt planner, he could drop six to eight clients on top of a guide in the field. He said that he would obviously not do that because of his conservation ethics, but that other hunt planners are. He compared the situation to providing hunt planners with a loaded gun, as there are no restrictions, and it creates conflict with guides and other hunt planners. He said that he used to send 35 groups of hunters into the field but now is down to six because of his conservation ethics due to the depleting amount of game in the field. He said that he does not know what to do about the situation, but that he was available for any workgroup or any type of goal towards legislation. Mike Flores asked him how the board would restrict hunt planners, if they licensed them, to which he said he would model it somehow after the guide use areas (GUAs), which would restrict the number of hunters being dropped in certain areas around the state. He said that it would also require hunt planners to know the areas around the state, something that a lot of hunt planners from outside of Alaska do not. He said that there are a lot of hunt planners from outside of Alaska that simply hire a pilot to drop their clients off in an area, not knowing or caring about who else is already there, which causes conflicts in the field. Martin Boniek asked how many hunt planners there are, to which Mr. Bartlett said there are around 30 and not even half of them live in Alaska. Chairman Bunch asked him to explain what a hunt planner is. Mr. Bartlett said that a hunt planner is someone who likely has at least some geographical awareness of where they are dropping clients, likely has some knowledge of GMUs in the Alaska state regulations, likely does not know what the cooperation of the land management requires or appreciates, what law enforcement officers are monitoring for in unhealthy trends, and has no prior knowledge other than what is available to kill and how many people they can get into the field. Mr. Bloomquist agreed with Mr. Bartlett, that the increasing industry of hunt planners is affecting the entire guiding industry, with most of them having no conservation background, dropping people in areas they have almost no knowledge of, and ruining experiences for a lot of people. Unfortunately, he said, there really is not a lot the board can do about it with their current statutes and regulations, adding that there is an argument that hunt planners are really acting as unlicensed guide-outfitters and/or transporters because they are advertising as such. He said that regulating hunt planners would require legislative approval, something he would like to see happen. Chairman Bunch suggested that the board create a workgroup, at a later time because of their current workload, and get the backing of LAW to begin discussion on the topic. Mr. Boniek asked for a raise of hands from the audience on whether they thought it was a big problem, to which most of the audience raised their hands. The board thanked Mr. Bartlett for his time and decided to take a break before the next regulation proposal.

Supervision		
Brief Discussion: On Record: 2:00 p.m.	<p>Back from break, the board began discussion on two new proposals regarding supervision, both provided by Wayne Kubat. Chairman Bunch gave him the floor. Mr. Kubat said that his first proposal is an amendment to 12 AAC 75.240. SUPERVISION(f)., for allowing a registered guide-outfitter or class-A assistant guide the ability to supervise an assistant guide within 200 miles of their location. He said that it would be beneficial to assistant guides because they would no longer be passed over as often just because their class of guide license is insufficient, as the current regulations often times require a class-A assistant guide or registered guide-outfitter be hired because of GUA boundaries. His second proposal is an amendment to 12 AAC 75.240. SUPERVISION(f), (i), and (j)., to clean up regulation that will help guides not be undeservedly investigated and/or prosecuted and shows the industry in a positive light by requiring reasonable proximity to clients and hunts. Mr. Bloomquist said that everybody has their own perception of what supervision should be, so there are many differing perceptions, and that he would be fine with continuing with the workgroup on it but that he had been working on it for years and was tired of it not going anywhere. He said that he would not be approving the regulation proposal. Chairman Bunch said that the original intent of the statute has to be considered, something that would need discussed, and said that he would not be considering either of the proposals. Mr. Kubat said that he was not expecting the board to approve his proposals but wanted to keep the conversation moving along. He said that he believed a final proposal was very close to being finished, something that may only be a few hours away with the workgroup. He thanked the board for their time.</p>	
Transporter Activity Report Revision		
Brief Discussion:	<p>The board reviewed an updated version of the Transporter Activity Report (TAR) that Mr. Flores created. Mr. Flores reminded the board that the reason for the new version was to clean up the TAR so that it required information vital to the board versus information that the board does not use. He informed the board that the updated version would require the person transporting to write their name in addition to signing it, so it was clear who was transporting. He said that the "Estimated Pounds of Meat Transported" was going to be changed to the "Number of Animals." He also said that the new form would have a checkbox at the top of the form, for the type of transporting being done, titled, "Marine Drop-Off & Pick-Up w/ Overnight." He said that they would also be adding a marine only section on the bottom right, to include all crew members because of the regulation project requiring two captains onboard. The board approved of the changes.</p>	
Motion:	<p>Move to approve to send to the drafter the proposed regulation project to amend 12 AAC 75.400, to replace the Transporter Activity Report with the provided revision. (First: Flores; Second: Boniek).</p>	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Transporter Sticker		

Brief Discussion:	Mr. Flores presented the board with a sticker he developed for their regulation project for marine vessel identification.	
Motion:	Move to approve to add the provided sticker to the current regulation project for marine vessel identification for guides and transporters (First: Flores; Second: Buist).	
Brief Discussion:	Mr. Flores presented the board with a sticker he developed for their regulation project for marine vessel identification. Mr. Boniek stated that he was in approval for the sticker to be added to marine vessels, but that he was not in approval for a sticker to be added to planes, which was another current regulation project. Mr. Bloomquist said that he would not be voting for approval of the sticker because he does not believe there is a need for guides to be required to have stickers on their boats, most of which are smaller boats, such as skiffs. Chairman Bunch reminded the board that there was a lot of uncertainty when they voted to add this as a regulation project, and that the main goal was to garner public comment and go from there.	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Yes
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Brief Discussion: Off Record: 2:37 p.m.	Being ahead of schedule, the board decided to take a break.	
6. Public Comment		
Brief Discussion: On Record: 3:01 p.m.	Back from break, the board began their second public comment period of the day. Mr. Bay created a list of attendees that wanted to provide public comment. The board began public comment.	
Mark Richards	<p>Mark Richards, Executive Director of the Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK), said that he would not be able to attend the Guide Concession Program (GCP) meeting later in the day and provided his thoughts on the topic. He said that he had not heard the board express what the problem was for needing the GCP, so he provided information from 2008 that was the cause for the formation of the previous GCP that failed. He read a statement from the Alaska Professional Hunters Association (APHA), which stated, "Currently, overcrowding of guides on state lands combined with decreasing wildlife populations is stimulating social disorder between hunter user groups and biological harm to our wildlife, which leads to establishment of restrictive drawing permit hunts." He said he assumes this is the same reason for another attempt to get a GCP established. If so, he said that RHAK opposes the need for having a GCP because the problem is not overcrowding of guides. Instead, he said, the issue has always been too many nonresident hunters that are required to hire a guide and given unlimited opportunity to hunt and harvest certain species by the BOG. He said that, over the years, RHAK has requested that the BOG limit nonresident hunters, but that the BOG has consistently said that there is only one solution, the GCP. He said that he has always believed that the BGCSB has the authority to regulate guides, but do not. He said that DNR's first alternative to the GCP is the BOG further restricting nonresident hunter opportunities, something that RHAK has been saying the entire time. He said that DNR's first alternative to the GCP, regarding the BGCSB, is to have</p>	

	<p>the BGCSB reduce the number of GUAs that a guide can register for, which would reduce the number of guides in GUAs as well as reduce the amount of user conflict in the field. He said that DNR's second alternative to the GCP, regarding the BGCSB, is to have the BGCSB increase the overall number of GUAs by subdividing and reducing the size of existing GUAs, which would provide the same amount of GUAs that are currently allowed but would also provide for smaller areas. He said that the point is that the BGCSB is supposed to regulate guides and the BOG is supposed to regulate hunters and deal with conservation issues. He said that the BGCSB has the authority to do what they are trying to get done with the GCP, and that the GCP is never going to work because of the legalities of the situation. He asked the board to do their job and regulate guides through their existing regulations instead of trying to create a program that will not work. Mr. Bloomquist agreed that the board could remap GUAs, which would not be an easy task, but was an option. With nothing left to discuss the board thanked Mr. Richards for his testimony. Mr. Bloomquist left the meeting for the remainder of the meeting. A quorum was still established.</p>
<p>Coke Wallace</p>	<p>Coke Wallace, a master guide-outfitter, said that this is not the first time the board's had a game animal problem in Alaska. He said that in 1945 the USFWS said hunters were astonished to find but a fraction of the sheep they had seen in the past, and that the difference between then and now is that the government, in the past, trusted the private individual to take care of the problem, and, after taking that right away, the government is not doing a good job of it right now. He said the biologists are doing the best they can do, but they are also playing politics just as much as they are managing game. He acknowledged that humans are the problem, and you cannot legislate ethics. He said he has frustratingly seen the board allow guides to keep their licenses when everyone knows they are not a good representative of industry. He said that, while he understands that the board does not have a hammer to swing at those types of guides, something has to be done soon with them and game management in general or there will be nothing left to guide for. He said that there are a lot of problems with guides in his units, including jumping in right next to him and hunting with airplanes. He said the problem is that the board does not enforce the rules evenly, stating that the big issues in the field get swept under the rug while the little issues, such as paperwork violations and self-turn-ins, are enforced at a high degree. He said that there needs to be something done with the GCP or everybody will be forced to turn to permitting on everything. He questioned the closing of 19C by the Board of Game and said that it has forced guides into his areas, and that, while he is self-regulating, he has to try and produce some sheep this year. He said that he was shocked to hear what Larry Bartlett said about hunt planners and he thinks it is a bigger issue than some of the other issues the board is currently dealing with. Chairman Bunch asked him what he thought of Mark Richards' comments regarding the possibility of decreasing the size of current GUAs, to which he said that they are already too small. Chairman Bunch asked him what he thought about reducing the amount of GUAs for a guide from three to two, to which he said that he would be onboard if it helped the industry. Chairman Bunch asked him if he thought DNR could, through permitting, help with some of the issues he addressed, to which he said that he was unsure because of his past experiences with DNR. Chairman Bunch said that, as far as the big versus little issues problem goes, the board cannot do anything unless AWT acts on them. He said that the only way for things to change, in his opinion, is for all of the agencies to get together, build relationships, and gain trust amongst each other, to bring valid, realistic issues, and garner</p>

	<p>a little bit of attention to maybe push those agencies to do better, or to look for change in their own agencies. Mr. Wallace finished by saying that he is very angry that his son is not going to have the same opportunities that he had during his career as a guide, and that the board needs to charge nonresident guides 10 times the amount of a resident guide's license fee, instead of the current two times the amount. The board thanked Mr. Wallace for his testimony.</p>
<p>Al Barrette</p>	<p>Al Barrette, a class-A assistant guide and member of the BOG, said that he was not representing the BOG at the meeting and that his comments were his own. He said that the hunt planner issue is something that needs tended to immediately. He said that hunt planners are getting bolder and bolder in the areas he guides, and the hunters are getting upset. He said that hunt planners are sending too many hunters into the field and leaving them in the field too long, which has turned into violations and citations because hunters are leaving the field before the meat from their harvests. He said that they also use and are burning out pilots that do not know the weather conditions in the area very well. He said that it has created a lot of competition with the local communities, as it affects their livelihood. He said that hunt planners need to self-regulate. Referring to the conversation earlier in the day in regard to trying to get more licensees involved in the industry and having a better turnout to board meetings and important discussions, he suggested that the board maybe create an incentive, such as an online class that would reduce licensing fees at renewal. Mike Flores said that if the board were to license hunt planners it would not affect the flow of hunters and asked him what his thoughts were on it, to which he said he was still working on a solution and that he just wanted to the board to know that it really is a growing industry that was not an issue 10 years ago but now is. The board thanked Mr. Barrette for his testimony.</p>
<p>Phil Byrd</p>	<p>Phil Byrd, a registered guide-outfitter, said that he was in attendance to talk about the supervision proposal. He said that, when he was an up-and-coming guide, he tried to come up with language for supervision in regulation, and that it was not easy. He said that the current proposal is nearly two pages long and suggested that it could be reduced to half a paragraph. He also said that he is in full disagreement of being able to supervise a hunt statewide, saying that you cannot provide the quality of experience that hunters deserve while supervising from anywhere in Alaska because you are just supervising a supervisor at that point. He said that, while access to communication has evolved with technology, it is important to have the guide-outfitter available, in-person, during certain times when a guided hunt does not go well, and the client needs reassurance to stay in the field for the duration of the hunt. He said that the board, over the years, has continuously tried to fix problems in the field that happen to a very low percentage of the overall industry, and it has caused the industry to regulate themselves out of business. He said that the topic of supervision has been discussed for years and that what they have now in regulation works fairly well. Lastly, he said that the hunt planner issue needs to be addressed but was not sure if it could even be done legally. Chairman Bunch asked him what he thought about the possibility of decreasing the size of current GUAs, to which he said he was undecided and that he would have to think about it. Chairman Bunch asked him what he thought about the possibility of going to two GUAs, to which he said it might work, but it depends on the individual guide and where they are guiding. The board thanked Mr. Byrd for his testimony.</p>

<p>Tim Booch</p>	<p>Tim Booch, who had previously provided public comment, said that Mr. Bartlett’s testimony regarding hunt planners was the most shocking testimony he has heard in 42 years of guiding, and said that it is the most important issue before the board. He also suggested that the board create a workgroup, with board member Pete Buist included because of his previous experience working for DNR and address the DNR commercial land use permitting guideline changes he discussed earlier in the meeting. The board thanked Mr. Booch for his testimony.</p>
<p>Nate Turner</p>	<p>Nate Turner, a registered guide-outfitter, said that he agreed with a lot with Phil Byrd’s testimony. He said that loosening supervision actually moves it more towards hunt planning, ironically, and that contracting guides need to have a direct interaction with their clients and be held accountable. He said that Al Barrette had a great idea, to incentivize continuing education, and that it has a lot of merit because a lot of guides do not know that they should know more about the industry than they already do. Regarding the GCP, he said that it needs to be understood that DNR, during the first GCP try, had previously said that they did not know a lot about the guiding industry, and caused a lot of fear to the industry. He said that the GCP needs to be established. Chairman Bunch asked him to elaborate on his opinion regarding supervision, to which he said that, as a contracting guide, you should be available in the field at any time to be held accountable, to fix situations that come up with clients, and that it is the only way to run a successful guiding business. The board thanked Mr. Turner for his testimony.</p>
<p>Zach Decker</p>	<p>Zach Decker, a registered guide-outfitter, said that his operation is a little different than most operations in the state. He said that making some of the changes discuss during the meeting would really affect operations in Southeast Alaska. He reminded the board that some islands only have one or two species and that everything is spread out. He said the idea of reducing GUA’s in the state would likely be beneficial in some areas, but that it would dramatically affect the service that Southeast Alaska guides provide. He informed the board that there has been an issue with the number of black bears in Southeast Alaska and that it is related to hunt planners bringing in several new groups of nonresident hunters every year. He said that, as far as the stickers on boats go, he wished that the board excluded guides from the requirement because they already have issues with being mixed with transporters. He said that he thinks, for all transporters, their boats and planes should have some type of identifying feature indicating that they are transporters. Regarding the GCP, he said that he believes there needs to be some sort of state land lease deal, that there needs to be viable business opportunities, and that it would look completely different if they started from scratch, something he thinks they should do because there is contention and confusion behind the current one. He informed the board that he sent a proposal to the BOG to request that an eight-mile stretch of beach, that is closed May 20th-31st, be opened during that time, so they can use that portion of their GUA. The recommendation from the chairman of the BOG was that he contact the BGCSB to move the GUA boundary line. Chairman Bunch said that he was more than welcome to submit a suggested boundary change that the board could review at a future meeting. Lastly, he said that he agreed with some of the other commenters, that the industry would rather regulate itself out of business than allow for some flexibility. The board thanked Mr. Decker for his testimony.</p>

<p>Steve Perrins</p>	<p>Steve Perrins, a master guide-outfitter, said that he has been in business for a long time and has seen how guiding and hunting has evolved over the years. He thanked the board for their openness and involvement with the industry and said that he feels more comfortable with the board now than probably the last ten years. He thanked the board for reaching out and establishing relationships and trust with licensees. He said, unfortunately, that was not the case with DNR and the last go around with the GCP. He reminded everybody in attendance that DNR had previously taken away guide camps that were historically there forever, basically accusing guides of illegally squatting on state land, and had Commerce not renew guide licenses until those guides removed their camps. The following year DNR said those guides can have their camps, but that they had to get them permitted. He said that because of the trust that was lost with DNR, having DNR as a partner for the new GCP, there is hesitancy from the guide community. However, he said that he felt DNR has been much more open recently, and them showing up to the meeting in-person was extremely important to mending relationships. He said, as far as splitting up GUAs, that it could be done in certain areas but not all of them. He said that if areas are split up and/or guides are limited in certain areas, that affected guides should be given time to change their business plans. He also said that hard choices need to be made regarding the GCP and that the board should not be afraid of being sued for making difficult choices. He said that not everybody is going to be happy with the GCP and that whatever comes of it, if it is implemented, someone is going to sue, and that the board should let the Department of Law deal with it. He said that he appreciates the communication with the ListServ, but that the board should send out correspondence via postage mail to the roughly 33% of guides that do not use it. Mr. Flores asked him how many sheep hunts he was likely to have this year, to which he responded that he had three sheep hunts scheduled and that, while they hunt out of three camps, they are likely going to have to explore sheep hunts through two additional camps he has because of how bad the available resource is. While one of those camps is viable, he stated, the other has not been for two years because of a mining company that has been all over the area with their equipment being flown in and out and having riggs on the ground only eight miles away from their camp, which DNR permitted. With nothing left to discuss, the board thanked Mr. Perrins for his testimony.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Day Three

1. Review Agenda

Brief Discussion:	No discussion to amend the agenda.
--------------------------	------------------------------------

Motion:	Move to accept the agenda as written (First: Boniek; Second: Buist).
----------------	--

Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores – Absent (excused)
	Bloomquist - Absent (excused)	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes

2. Public Comment

Brief Discussion:	Being ahead of schedule, the board moved into public comment early at 9:07 a.m.
Steve Perrins	Mr. Perrins said that guides are likely going to be bouncing around to different areas because of the closure to 19C, limited resources, and overcrowding, and asked if there could be a moratorium on new GUAs or possibly increasing the number of years a contracting guide has to register for, changing the current minimum number of years from three to five. Chairman Bunch said the three-to-five-year minimum number of years to register for a GUA is doable and the freeze on issuing GUA's might be possible, but that both would require regulation projects which would likely not be done for a year or two. Mr. Perrins said that the issue and his suggestions should be raised with the GCP. The board thanked Mr. Perrins for his testimony.
Wayne Kubat	Mr. Kubat voiced his concern with having a fair GCP program, saying that he is worried that established registered guides will have an unfair advantage compared to incoming registered guides simply because of their experience. He suggested that something be in place that is equivalent to the PFD, so that everybody is created equal and has the same chance to get the same areas. He said he disagrees with getting rid of DNR over-the-counter permits because interior regions only accessible to bush aircraft have small pockets of game spread across wide areas where guides have to be flexible. He said that he would prefer the BGCSB limit guides to two areas and make GUAs smaller rather than go through the process of a GCP program and coming out with nothing through a limited draw process. The board thanked Mr. Kubat for his testimony.
James Smith	James Smith, a registered guide-outfitter, said he was commenting on some of the things other guides commented on the day before. He said that, in regard to guides not knowing what is going on in the industry, there is good communication from the board and staff, as well as other guides, and that if people do not get involved then it is their own fault. He said that, in regard to Larry's Bartlett's testimony, newer hunt planners are hiring more and more out of state pilots who do not know the areas they are flying into, and that they are jumping around the state right on top of guides and hunters. He said that something needs to be done. He said that, in regard to conflict in the field with state and federal land users, that if you have a federal concession and know that there are good guides on bordering state land, you should not even be going on that state land. However, he said that if you know the state land is not being used, feel free to use it. He said that, in regard to the supervision proposal, the board should keep the current regulations overseeing supervision because the proposal would only help a small number of guides and the majority of guides do not want it. Lastly, regarding the GCP, he said that if there was any doubt for it being passed, the board should do something now to ensure what happened to guides in 19C does not happen to the rest of the industry because of limited resources. The board thanked Mr. Smith for his testimony.
Michael Sciotti	Michael Sciotti, a registered guide-outfitter, said that he is largely against the GCP. He said that he was hearing a lot of guides concerned about other guides jumping into their areas, basically overnight, because of overcrowding and/or lack of resources in other areas. He said that the concern is not necessarily legitimate because of the barriers to entry already in place to get a new area, such as building time in a unit, taking and passing a GMU exam which is only available twice a year, getting land use authorizations, getting a GUA through the BGCSB, etc. He said that, if the board uses retired and/or currently licensed guide-outfitters as part of the judging process to receive state concessions, there could be a

	<p>serious issue with the GCP because of potential conflict-of-interest scenarios, such as a guide-outfitter either liking or disliking an applicant and having an influence on their application. He said that he is worried about the availability of the opportunity for newly licensed and recently licensed registered guides and that, for the industry, there needs to be an obvious structure of growth and advancement. He said that, if the board is going to continue with the GCP, heavy preference should be given to resident registered and master guides, and even more consideration to resident registered and master guides who employ resident assistant guides. His biggest concern is that, if the GCP goes into effect, Alaskan residents lose their businesses on Alaska land to operators that do not reside in the state. If that were to happen, he said, the State of Alaska and the BGCSB has failed to uphold the Alaskan constitution. He said that resident guides are vital to the economy of Alaska for obvious reasons, such as receiving money from outside of Alaska and using it to create wealth to resident communities, instead of sending that money out-of-state. He said that providing preference to resident hunters would be an incentive for nonresident guides to move to Alaska, further aiding the industry because it would force them to get involved with their communities and be better at managing their guide use areas because they would far better understand the local and Alaskan perspective of animals and land use. Without this, he said, the system would quickly turn to look like guiding in Canada or the fishing industry in Alaska, with all of the money, power, and influence going to nonresidents. He suggested that the permits for a GCP should be transferrable, which would allow a guide-outfitter to sell his business. He suggested that there also needs to be a limit on transporters if the board decides to move forward with the GCP. Lastly, he said that the big problem areas, and reason for discussion about creating a GCP, are localized parts of Alaska and that the entire state should not be included in the GCP. Pete Buist said that he agrees with Mr. Sciotti's suggestion to give resident guide-outfitters heavy preference over nonresidents, but that he learned, during the previous GCP try, that it is likely not legal to do so, as LAW did not approve it. The board thanked Mr. Sciotti for his testimony.</p>
<p>Tim Booch</p>	<p>Mr. Booch thanked Chairman Bunch for saying, at the GCP meeting the night before, that the guide industry is directly dependent on DNR and their management and overseeing of them. He said that he remembers, during that same meeting, a guide saying that DNR owns state land, and said that is not true. He said the people are the owners of state land and that DNR is a contracted government service provider. He said that before they can work with DNR they need to be able to trust them, and the immediate removal of a guide camp that was permitted by DNR, which allowed a helicopter access to build a camp right next to Coke Wallace's camp, would be a good faith effort to repair the relationship. He said that it comes down to the six points that he provided during public comment on day one of the board meeting. Chairman Bunch informed him that he forwarded his six points to DNR and the GCP workgroup. The board thanked Mr. Booch for his testimony.</p>
<p>Mike Zweng</p>	<p>Mike Zweng, a registered guide-outfitter, said that he had been listening to everyone's opinions on the GCP and the possibility of going down to two GUAs, and said that there are pros and cons to each of them. He said that writing a prospectus does not always select the most qualified guide to hunt in the area and the two GUA option is kind a broad brush and does not scale well to guides that are not hunting on state land and contributing to congestion. He suggested that the board assign a numerical cost to each GUA to register for them, a system where guide-outfitters are allocated points on a yearly basis. Each</p>

	<p>guide-outfitter would get three points to spend on GUAs. If a GUA does not have state land on it, the board could assign a cost of one point to it, which would allow a guide with three federal concessions to have three GUAs. If a GUA does have state land on it, the board could assign a cost of one and a half points to it. This would reduce the number of guides on state land, while not affecting guides who do not guide on state land, reducing the highly congested areas, the entire goal of the GCP. The board could also assign more points to specific GUAs that are congested, such as three points for a single GUA, which would require a guide to spend all of their points on and limit them to a single GUA, reducing the number of guides that would want to register for that unit while not eliminating them entirely. This would be an alternative to having an immediate GCP and would also be a good way to bring guides to underutilized areas because the board could assign lower costs to them, making them more desirable. For GUAs with both state and federal land, if a guide is on federal land only, that guide would only be required to spend one point, but if that same guide wanted to also guide on state land in that same GUA, they would be required to spend one and a half points for the entire unit, only leaving them with another one and a half points and reducing the amount of GUAs they would be able to guide in for the year. This model would also allow the board to reduce points for violations on specific guides, using it as a tool to influence guide behavior. He said that it would be simple to implement while also reducing the burden on the BGCSB. He suggested setting up a website that allows you to shop like you do for licenses or drawing applications, where guides can go online once a year and spend whatever points they have on qualified GUAs. Chairman Bunch thanked him for thinking outside the box and asked him to forward his idea in writing to Mr. Bay. The board thanked Mr. Zweng for his testimony.</p>
<p>Gabe Davis</p>	<p>Gabe Davis, a registered guide-outfitter, said that all of the guides in GMU 17 have a good relationship but are having an issue with an ex-licensed guide and transporter working as an air taxi and who is taking more moose hunters than ever. He said that none of the GCP language so far talks about the aspects of air taxis. He also said that the GCP might be a good idea in some areas but not needed in others, such as GMU 17, and would create bigger problems. He said that if GUAs were reduced to two and were remapped to be smaller, that transporters and air taxis would just take more people into the field. He finished by saying that GMU 17 has become a brown bear predator control designated area and that the state is spending a bunch of money to fly in helicopters and shoot brown bears. That, combined with the possibility of restricting the size of the area and guides in the area to hunt bears, creates a monetary issue because state money is being spent on both ends to accomplish different things. He said that besides the GCP being area specific it also needs to be species specific. The board thanked Mr. Davis for his testimony.</p>
<p>Zach Basmajian</p>	<p>Zach Basmajian, an assistant guide, asked if a guide were to get approval on state land through the GCP, if only brown bear was listed on their license, for example, would the other animal resources in the area go to waste. He was concerned for an avenue of advancement for an assistant guide within the GCP, if it came to fruition. He was concerned that guide-outfitters might go out of business if they did not get a state-issued concession. He was also concerned that newly licensed guide-outfitters might have to wait years for areas to become available, only to take GMU exams while waiting for an opportunity to be selected for an area that they might not get. Pete Buist thanked him for providing testimony as an assistant guide, something that does not happen often.</p>

<p>Austin Atkinson</p>	<p>Austin Atkinson, a nonresident class-A assistant guide, said that Alaska is the pinnacle of hunting and wildlife conservation in the West, and that a lot of other states use Alaska as an example. He asked that the board consider the costs of hunting in Alaska and be careful not to have their industry turn into something like Canada, where it is run by corporations. He said that, when costs go up and there is inflation, it really effects the everyday hunter and in turn effects resident hunters and Alaska’s first right to hunt the resource. He really wants incoming ethical and honest registered guides to be able to earn an area, do a good job, and live the Alaska dream. He asked that something gets done with the GCP quickly, so as to create clarity for the industry. Regarding hunt planners, he said that he works in an industry where he acts as a booking agent and requested that whatever the board decides to do, if they end up having authority over hunt planners, there needs to be clarity on what can be provided, what should be provided, and what should not be provided, as well as what can and cannot be provided while outside of the field. Chairman Bunch said that there really are no rules on hunt planners right now and asked him what his thoughts were on it, to which Mr. Atkinson said that his worry is that hunt planners push registered guides out of their areas simply because there is no limit to how many hunters can be sent out by a hunt planner, which causes congestion in the field. He said that hunt planners could probably be regulated and forced to play fair.</p>
<p>“Smokey” Don Duncan</p> <p>Off Record: 10:34 a.m.</p>	<p>Mr. Duncan, in regard to the two GUA suggestion in the GCP, suggested calling guide use areas game use areas because game use areas includes both state and federal land. He said that he has long promoted having a program to educate assistant guides because they are the ones doing a lot of the work in the field. He said there should be an exam with a lot of questions, they should be given the answers ahead of time, and, if they cannot get a high score, then they do not pass or get licensed and should have a penalty associated with the answers they miss. He said that there were two words being used interchangeably the day before at the meeting which should have not been, in regard to transporter stickers, and they were ‘marine’ and ‘boats.’ He said that marine deals with a boat on saltwater versus a boat on both saltwater and freshwater. Lastly, he said that he was not in favor of the transporter stickers because he was required to have one in the past on his camouflage boat and moose would notice it and leave the area. The board thanked Mr. Duncan for his testimony. With nobody else to provide testimony, Chairman Bunch closed public comment.</p>
<p>3. Position Statements</p>	
<p>Helicopters</p>	
<p>Brief Discussion: On Record: 11:17 a.m.</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch said that he did not think they needed to write a position statement on helicopters because of their regulation proposal but kept it on the agenda to make sure that the board was not moving forward with Aaron Bloomquist’s input. Mr. Bloomquist did not think the board needed to discuss the topic any further. Chairman Bunch asked the board if they thought writing a position statement on enforcement, regarding the use of helicopters, would be good in the interim. Mr. Bloomquist said he did not think there needed to be a position statement. Martin Boniek asked why not since there is confusion around the original intent of the use of helicopters. Mr. Bloomquist changed his mind. Pete Buist disagreed because a position statement does not hold any legal weight and would not be considered in court. Mr. Bloomquist suggested writing a proposal to the BOG, for review at their state meeting in 2024, and having it passed with them, saving time and</p>

	<p>probably getting it passed before the BGCSB could. Jerry Burnett, the BOG representative on the BGCSB, said the statewide meeting will not happen until 2025, so it would have to be an Agenda Change Request (ACR), and he did not know if this topic would fit as an ACR or if the board would approve it. However, he did support having a position statement on findings anytime there is an ambiguous regulation because courts do look at board findings when adjudicating regulations. Chairman Bunch asked if it would be easier if ADF&G submitted an ACR to the BOG, which Mr. Burnett said it would. Chairman Bunch suggested tabling the discussion until he could talk to ADF&G, to see if they would be willing to submit an ACR and find the best solution to getting a proposal to the BOG, to which the board agreed. Martin Boniek volunteered to discuss the topic with ADF&G and get back to the board.</p>
--	--

Partnerships	
---------------------	--

<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Mr. Bloomquist said that, while the partnerships discussion is important, most people are not worried about how they are being run at the moment, and that he was not sure what a position statement would say other than the board saying that they do not care how licensees run their partnerships as long as they make sure that whoever’s GUA they are using that they have a hunt record and financial contract for it. Chairman Bunch suggested tabling the discussion until a later time and that when they do write a position statement it has instructions on what is legal and what is not, to which the board agreed.</p>
---------------------------------	---

Hunt Record Signing	
----------------------------	--

<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch said that he added this topic to the agenda because it was a previous board discussion, and he did not want it to fall to the floor. He said that it is actually related to and goes with the topic of partnerships, so it should also be tabled included with the position statement on partnerships, to which the board agreed.</p>
---------------------------------	---

4. Prioritizing Ongoing Projects (continued)	
---	--

<p>Brief Discussion: Off Record: 11:45 a.m. On Record: 11:57 a.m.</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch said that he had been filling out the Prioritization Framework spreadsheet that he mentioned on day one of the meeting and needed a break because of technical difficulties getting the spreadsheet up on the screen. The board discussed different options regarding how to split up their regulation proposals in the hopes to have a high priority project ready to go out for public comment at their July meeting. The board asked division regulations specialist Alison Osborne what the timeline would be on getting a high priority project through to LAW, to which she said it depended on when she received the proposals and FAQ worksheets, which the board is required to help write, from the board’s executive administrator, Thomas Bay. Mr. Bay informed the board that he was extremely busy and needed to finish their December 2022 minutes before he could get the required paperwork to Ms. Osborne. Unfortunately, he said, the board did not create clear motions on the record from that meeting, so he had to go through almost all three days of the recording to get the board’s intent. Also, he reminded them that he was pretty much going to be unavailable during all of April because he had to catch up with his other board before their upcoming board meeting. Chairman Bunch asked Mr. Bay if he thought it was possible for the high priority project to get to the regulations specialist by June, which he said it probably could. Ms. Osborne said that receiving the regulations project in June would not leave enough time for LAW’s review and the 30-day public comment period before their</p>
--	---

	<p>July meeting, and that it would be August at the earliest. Mr. Bloomquist asked how long it would likely take after the board adopts a regulations project after public comment, for the regulations to take effect, to which Ms. Osborne said it was currently taking two to three months. With that information, Mr. Bloomquist suggested sending their two regulation proposals (really three, as listed below), which were already drafted to their liking, to the regulations specialist as a high priority project. After discussion, the board decided to prioritize their regulation projects into two projects, a high priority project and a lower priority project:</p> <p><u>High Priority</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 12 AAC 75.200 – REGISTERED GUIDE-OUTFITTER PROVIDING SERVICES 2. 12 AAC 75.230 – GUIDE USE AREA REGISTRATION 3. 12 AAC 75.260 – REGISTERED GUIDE-OUTFITTER CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS <p><u>Lower Priority</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 12 AAC 75.240 – SUPERVISION 2. 12 AAC 75.250 – PARTICIPATION IN A HUNT 3. 12 AAC 75.400 – TRANSPORTER ACTIVITY REPORT 4. 12 AAC 75.440 – PROFESSIONAL ETHICS STANDARDS FOR PROVIDERS OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES 5. 12 AAC 75.XXX – HELICOPTER USE 6. 12 AAC 75.XXX – MARINE TRANSPORTER VESSEL AND CAPTAIN REQUIREMENTS 7. 12 AAC 75.XXX – MARKING OF AIRCRAFT FOR GUIDES AND TRANSPORTERS 8. 12 AAC 75.XXX – MARKING OF BOATS FOR GUIDES AND TRANSPORTERS <p>Off Record: 12:39 p.m. After prioritizing their regulations projects, the board took lunch.</p>
Lunch	
5. Division Update	
Current Fiscal Report	
<p>Brief Discussion: On Record: 1:02 p.m.</p>	<p>Back from lunch, the board welcomed the division’s administrative operations manager, Melissa Dumas, to the meeting. Ms. Dumas provided the board with their 2023 1st/2nd quarter fiscal reports, which ultimately came to a very large surplus, something she said would need to be discussed during their fee analysis. Division Director Sylvan Robb joined the meeting, introduced herself as the new division director, and thanked the board for their willingness to be on the board. Director Robb began discussion on the next agenda item.</p>
Information Technology Project/Request for Expenditure Authority	
<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Director Robb informed the board that they had met with the division’s IT staff to work on their IT project and that they hoped to get something implemented within a few years. She said that the division needed more information on exactly what the board would be using the data for and wanted to make sure that the data entered is being used and is not more than what is statutorily required in AS 08.54.760. Chairman Bunch said that they would be using the information for investigative matters and AWT matters, to enforce the board’s regulations, mostly. However, he added, the board wants a self-service tool that guides can</p>

use to submit their own hunt records, which would ease the burden on board staff immensely. Chairman Bunch asked the board's investigator, Lee Strout, to elaborate on why the information would be helpful to his investigations. Mr. Strout said that the hunt record is a very important tool that has a bunch of data used for his investigations, and that AWT also uses them. The hunt record, he said, is a real-time record of a commercial hunt that has taken place in the field, which includes type of hunt, the names of guides, clients, when they hunted, where they hunted, any game that was harvested, type of transportation used, and attestation signatures by the guide and client certifying the information on the hunt record is true and correct. Mr. Strout said that hunt records are relied upon heavily during prosecutions if there are violations. Ms. Dumas said that the division was hoping to have less data points for a guide to enter into the self-service tool, and suggested up to four data points, making it less cumbersome for a guide to have to fill out. Chairman Bunch expressed his frustration with having a small amount of data points. He said that different agencies contact the board often for data, such as the number of transporters in a certain GMU/GUA for a certain year, how many guides provided services in a GMU/GUA and were successful for a certain year, etc. He said that staff should be able to search for any of the information on hunt records. As an example, he said that staff is unable to search to see if a guide had three successful harvests on a certain species-specific big game animal (sheep, moose, brown bear, mountain goat), which is a requirement to add them to their license as an animal they are allowed to guide for. Instead, staff has to go through all of the hunt records on file with a guide's name on it, one by one, to find out if they have had three successful hunts, a time-consuming task. Another example he provided was the ability to find out how many days in the field an assistant guide has. If an assistant guide applies to become a registered guide-outfitter, they are required to have 125 days in the field guiding experience, which can only be confirmed using hunt records. The current process is for staff to go through hunt records with the assistant guide's name on them and count the days their client went into the field and left the field, which is a very time-consuming process. He said that there needs to be a database that allows board staff to go in and quickly pull information that confirms an applicant is allowed to sit for the RGO exams. Ms. Dumas said that any information that is entered into the database can be pulled from IT through a request for a report from staff, and that no reports had been requested since 2008, and that she was unaware that the board wanted more reporting. She asked if a self-service tool would really save staff time in the long run if they had to go in and confirm the hunt record is complete and the information provided is correct, to which he said yes, because you can require the fields on the form to be filled in before moving forward and filling anymore information in on the hunt record, have all guides sign an affidavit attesting the information is true and correct, and require them to upload a copy of the hunt record. This would not require board staff to confirm that the hunt records are complete and accurate. Director Robb asked if it was a reasonable request to put the burden of entering information into a database on behalf of the board's licensees, to which Chairman Bunch said it is because it is not that big of a burden and has such a good benefit for everybody involved, the most being a benefit to board staff, which would allow more time for other board matters to get resolved. Mr. Bloomquist said that he has talked to programmers that have created much larger databases/self-service tools than what their board is requesting, and that they said a request like this could likely be done in a week and only cost around \$10,000. Director

	<p>Robb said that she could hear the board’s frustration and apologized because it sounded like the board has been dealing with this issue for quite some time. She assured them that they will not be continuing to have the same discussion and that the division will work with them moving forward. Chairman Bunch apologized for the board’s frustration and thanked Director Robb for acknowledging the situation. After stating that she only had a short amount of time left before she had to leave the meeting, Chairman Bunch said that the board has a lot of extra money that they would like to spend and asked her if there was a way to do that. She informed the board that the division is required, through statute, to charge enough fees to cover the administrative expenses of the program and that they require expenditure authority through the legislature to spend any money, something they do not have right now to spend any excess money that the board has. Mr. Bloomquist also expressed his frustration with not being able to use the board’s money, but for things like having meetings in different locations and having to go to BOG meetings with no reimbursement.</p>
--	---

<p>Executive Administrator Position</p>	
--	--

<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Chairman Bunch informed Director Robb that the board was interested in creating their own Executive Administrator position, so that they would have a full-time position dedicated to their program instead of splitting time with the Board of Marine Pilots and asked her what the process entailed. Director Robb reminded the board that although Mr. Bay was their Executive Administrator, the position did not actually exist because the board did not have statutory authority for an Executive Administrator. She informed the board that they would need to go on the record and make a motion to pursue legislation for an Executive Administrator and nominate someone as the board’s spokesperson with the legislature. Deputy Director Glenn Saviers informed the board that she could provide Mr. Bay with the statutory language from the other Executive Administrator positions in the division, so they could use the language to draft their own statutory language. The board thanked Director Robb and Deputy Director Saviers for the information and their time. Having nothing left to discuss, Director Robb and Deputy Director Saviers left the meeting.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<p>Part-Time Investigator</p>	
--------------------------------------	--

<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>The board decided to table this discussion.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<p>Fee Analysis</p>	
----------------------------	--

<p>Brief Discussion:</p>	<p>Moving onto the next topic, the board’s fee analysis, Chairman Bunch apologized to Ms. Dumas for the board’s frustration. Ms. Dumas said that she understood the board’s frustration, reiterated that the division was unaware that the board wanted more reporting, but now that they know, they are going to help find a solution moving forward. She also said that she did not know that board staff was sifting through individual hunt records to complete applications and that the division will work to streamline the process. Ms. Dumas started discussion on the board’s fee analysis, reminding them that they were up for renewal at the end of the year, and, because of their very large surplus in revenue and the statutory requirement to try to keep the board’s revenue approximately even, they needed to lower some of their fees. She also reminded the board that, during their last meeting, they discussed possibly eliminating the \$300 Annual Filing Fee because the fee was originally created to help increase the board’s revenue when it was in a deficit.</p>
---------------------------------	---

Off Record: 2:36 p.m.	After discussion between the board and Ms. Dumas, and after using an Excel sheet to test out fee adjustments, the board decided to eliminate the \$300 Annual Filing Fee and reduce both the assistant guide and class-A assistant guide license fees by \$100. The board thanked Ms. Dumas for her help and took a break.	
Executive Administrator Position		
Brief Discussion: On Record: 3:07 p.m.	The board discussed the pay range for the Executive Administrator position. Chairman Bunch suggested the board create a high pay range, specifically a range 23. He said the range would make the position more valuable, easily fillable if Mr. Bay ever left the board, and support longevity.	
Motion:	Move to pursue legislation to create a range 23 Executive Administrator position for the Big Game Commercial Services Board. Pete Buist will be the board's liaison and spokesperson (First: Pete Buist; Second: Martin Boniek).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Absent (excused)
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Fee Analysis		
Brief Discussion:	Having already discussed their fee changes, the board motioned to approve them.	
Motion:	Move to approve a fee change, as proposed by the board, which includes eliminating the \$300 Annual Filing Fee and the reduction of class A assistant guide licenses and assistant guide license fees by \$100 (First: Pete Buist; Second: Clay Nordlum).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Absent (excused)
	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Board Business		
Annual Report		
Brief Discussion:	Mr. Bay reminded the board that they needed to write their FY23 annual report and that he needed help from the board. After discussion, the board decided to have Jason Bunch, Aaron Bloomquist, Martin Boniek, and Mike Flores help Mr. Bay draft the FY23 annual report.	
Motion:	Move to appoint board members Jason Bunch, Aaron Bloomquist, Martin Boniek, and Mike Flores to help Mr. Bay draft the FY23 annual report (First: Pete Buist; Second: Clay Nordlum).	
Recorded Votes:	Buist - Yes	Burnett - Yes
	Boniek - Yes	Flores - Absent (excused)

	Bloomquist - Yes	Kunder - Absent (excused)
	Bunch - Yes	Nordlum - Yes
Administrative Business		
Brief Discussion:	After discussion, the board decided to hold their December 2023 board meeting at the Coast Inn at Lake Hood Hotel December 5 th - 7 th .	
Task List		
Brief Discussion:	<p>Mr. Bay provided the board their task list from the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finish December 2022 meeting minutes (Bay) 2. Write March 2023 meeting minutes (Bay) 3. Write the denial letter for the license application that was denied (Bay) 4. Add the new regulation projects to the board's current projects, split them into high and low priority projects, and get them to the regulations specialist (Bay) 5. Get the fee change motion to the division (Bay) 6. Annual Report (Bay, Bunch, Bloomquist, Boniek, Flores) 	
10. Adjourn		
Brief Discussion:	Having nothing left to discuss, the board adjourned.	
Adjourn:	3:31 p.m.	

Date Final Minutes Approved by the Board: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meeting <input type="checkbox"/> OnBoard	December 4-6, 2023
---	--------------------