

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1364

2007 HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES

HB 1364

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1364

House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 26, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2003

Committee Clerk Signature

*Shirley Oemsted*

Minutes:

**Chairman Porter** opened the hearing on HB 1364 and the clerk read the title.

**Representative Lyle Hanson** from District #12 introduced HB 1364 as Representative Nelson was not yet present at the hearing. He is not the prime sponsor but he is in support of this bill.

The bill is asking to raise the cost of a deer buck license to \$35.00 and reduce the doe from \$20.00 to \$10.00. There have been many requests to do this. There is a fiscal note with a loss of \$400,000 for the biennium. He thinks this can probably be reduced if they change the numbers from ten dollars to fifteen dollars on the doe license or raise the buck license to forty dollars from thirty five. We had this bill two years ago and it passed the House but was defeated in the Senate by a narrow margin. He passed out a list of the states in the country that have deer hunting and you can see that most states have more than \$20.00 that we have here. See attachment marked as Item #1. South Dakota charges \$35.00 for either a buck or doe license. Montana is a little lower than that.

**Representative Keiser** said he was intrigued by some of the amounts on the chart. He made reference to Washington at \$39.42. Why is that?

**Representative Hanson** said it was a rescue fee. Any of the states that have an odd number of cents on their fee are the results of a rescue fee.

**Representative DeKrey** asked what a rescue fee was.

**Representative Hanson** said if someone gets lost and they have to go out and find you, you pay ahead of time.

**Representative Jon Nelson** of District 7 introduced HB 1364. See attached written testimony attached as Item #2. This is almost identical to a bill that was introduced last session. This bill would increase the cost of a buck license to \$35.00 and lower a doe license to \$10.00 in an effort to create an incentive for more people to hunt does. The communities and drivers on the roadway are having a lot of accidents because of the overabundance of does. The other component is that there is some hunting dissatisfaction from the hunting public that as you apply for a deer license most people will send in multiple buck applications. My intend is not to cause a financial burden on the Game and Fish and will try to work through that issue with them on this. The main component is to get a handle on the doe populations in this state. He said that he would be friendly to an amendment to this bill if that would be appropriate.

**Chairman Porter** asked if he got any kind of a clearance from Representative Belter.

**Representative Nelson** said he didn't feel a need to do that.

**Representative Meyer** asked how many doe tags were not applied for last year.

**Representative Nelson** said that it is different by every unit. Game and Fish should have that information. In some units they are all sold, but not in others.

**Representative Nottestad** said that you speak of this bill as lowering the population of does. That is good in the areas where it is still needed. Maybe it would be justified to charge a lower rate in those units that are not sold out.

**Representative Nelson** said first of all he thought it would be good to hear the numbers from Game and Fish but the department has the ability to raise and lower their number of licenses that can be applied for. They are the experts in the field and they should make those

determinations. That may meet the one objective of lowering of the doe populations, but I will guarantee you that in units where they are selling out the doe applications there are a number of upset buck hunters where some families are getting multiple buck licenses and other families are getting none because everyone is applying for buck licenses. That brings this full circle and addresses the problems we are trying to address here.

**Representative Nottestad** said that do you think that raising this by \$15.00 is going to make these young people nervous when they are paying sixty, one hundred or one hundred twenty five dollars for a rock concert ticket.

**Representative Nelson** said that was a good point. I thought this would make a difference, but there are people who think this IS a significant increase. Based on the inflationary figures this should already be about \$50.00 fee today but it hasn't increased for twenty some years.

Sportsmen in this state have been getting a very good deal.

**Representative Hunskor** said he talked about families getting multiple buck licenses. Is that an isolated thing or do quite a few families run into that situation?

**Representative Nelson** said it is across the board. In the current system it is the same cost to put in for a buck as a doe. If you are a lucky family, everyone could get a buck license.

**Representative Charging** asked what will change. The buck hunters want to apply for a buck license and shoot a big buck. How will this address the problem?

**Representative Nelson** said yes the buck hunter will still apply for the buck but his wife may not. He feels like there will be fewer people applying for buck licenses and you will have a better chance of getting a buck license.

**Chairman Porter** asked for further testimony in favor of HB 1364. There was none. He asked for opposition of HB 1364.

**Mr. Foster Hager** left testimony in opposition of this bill. He was not present. Please see testimony marked as Item #3.

**Mr. Paul Schadewald** from the North Dakota Game and Fish came forward in opposition to HB 1364. Please see written testimony marked as Item #4. In the first drawing, they issue approximately 48,000 buck tags and there are about 60,000 people applying for those tags. We don't think that raising the fee to \$35.00 will significantly affect the amount of people applying for buck permits. People want bucks in North Dakota. They are essentially selling all the doe tags at \$20.00 each. There are a few units that vary from year to year on the number of licenses that you have but there may be a handful of units that have tags left in them. There are some units in the Devils Lake area that may have several hundred tags left. It is not a matter of finances in those situations. It is a matter of access to the property and a matter of those localities do not have a lot of people in them. We see this as a change that would cause some challenges for us. The second issue is that under this scenario we are going to have to send refund checks and possibly as many as 20,000 if they apply for a buck and get a doe license.

**Chairman Porter** said in your testimony you say there would be a cost involved but did not explain that cost. What would the costs be?

**Mr. Schadewald** said the administrative costs of \$10,000 would be included in this for postage and those types of costs. Initially there would be some software changes as well. There would also be a number of checks going through the accounting system but he did not think they paid per check.

**Chairman Porter** said you end your paragraph in your testimony by saying there would be costs associated with this like it would be in addition to the \$10,000.00.

**Mr. Schadewald** said that it would be in the neighborhood of ten to fifteen thousand dollars including the postage. This also does not address the archery deer fees which are the same situation. We would need some clarification on bow hunting tags as well.

**Representative Hanson** said the answer on bow hunting is answered on number three where it lists the exceptions below. The bow license would stay at twenty dollars.

**Mr. Schadewald** said the bill says antlered deer and does not say antlered deer gun or bow.

**Representative Hanson** said the department's goal in deer management is one hundred thousand. Once you get one hundred thousand, you will probably be selling fifty thousand buck tags and fifty thousand doe tags so it will be neutral at that time.

**Mr. Schadewald** said that was true. They are getting closer to the 100,000 tag goal.

**Representative Hanson** said so if we go to the thirty five and ten you would have no problem then; in fact you would have a plus.

**Mr. Schadewald** said at lower license numbers that would be correct.

**Representative Keiser** asked if the department feels there is a problem in some areas currently.

**Mr. Schadewald** said there certainly is a problem with higher deer numbers in some areas. Currently we do not think we have a problem with the license fees.

**Representative Keiser** said the co-sponsors have attempted to address that and you are saying this doesn't do that. What is the department's solution to solving those problems in those areas?

**Mr. Schadewald** said their solution has been to issue large numbers of doe tags and keep working away at that. It is a challenge. We have to work on certain areas where there is not a big demand for hunting as well as working with farmers for access to reduce those deer herds.

It is working in a lot of units but we still have a ways to go. For larger operations and access, the jury is still out.

**Representative Keiser** said that brings him back to his questions. What is the proposal from the department to solve that?

**Mr. Schadewald** said we are keeping the course and see what happens. There has been success in some units because the numbers are going down. We are managing with the gun in some units.

**Chairman Porter** referred to the language on line 11 after September 1<sup>st</sup> the director may reduce the license fee for any remaining antlerless deer licenses. Is that portion a tool that would be useful for the department for further incentives for those tags that are just there in those areas that are hard to get after?

**Mr. Schadewald** said he did not think the fee change would have a significant impact for us but maybe it would be something we could give a try and see how it does.

**Representative Drovdal** asked how many gun deer were issued last hunting season and how many actual hunters received those licenses.

**Mr. Schadewald** they issued somewhere in the neighborhood of 140,000 licenses. About 80,000 hunters were issued those licenses.

**Mr. Mike McEnroe** of the ND Chapter of the Wildlife Society came forward in opposition of HB 1364. See written testimony marked as Item #5.

**Representative Keiser** referred to line 11 and 12 giving the director some flexibility to reduce the license fee after September 1. What is your position on this?

**Mr. McEnroe** said he thought this might help sell the rest of the licenses in those units. On the other hand if you have paid more for your buck license and you have the opportunity for two or three or four other doe permits, you may not have the incentive to fill those other doe licenses



as you probably don't need the meat. Paul could probably give us the data on those other two, three, and four deer tags.

**Representative Hanson** asked if they had a reduced fee for youth now.

**Mr. McEnroe** said yes he did.

**Representative Hanson** asked why he mentioned in his testimony that it would cost so much if a father were to buy tags for his sons or daughters.

**Mr. McEnroe** said that if a husband wants to put in a buck license for his wife, it is the same thing.

**Chairman Porter** asked for further testimony in opposition for HB 1364. Seeing none, the hearing was closed.

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1364

House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 26, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2004

Committee Clerk Signature

*Spurley Olmsted*

Minutes:

**Chairman Porter** said there should be some more information regarding this particular bill as far as what it will do for the September 1<sup>st</sup> provision and the numbers of licenses left. I would like to put together a sub-committee consisting of **Representative DeKrey**, **Representative Clark** and **Representative Hanson**.

**Representative DeKrey** asked what the survey showed last year.

**Mr. Paul Schadewald** said he would get that information for them.

The session was closed.

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1364


House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 1, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2586

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

**Chairman Porter** opened the discussion on HB 1364.

**Representative DeKrey** offered an amendment to this bill. Reference proposed amendment 70633.0101. What the amendment does is when you apply for an antlered deer the application would be \$30.00 for the deer tag and a nonrefundable \$10.00 application fee. You would receive one of three things. You will either get a buck license for that \$30.00 or you will get a \$20.00 check back and get a doe tag. You will generate about \$350,000 for Game and Fish to administer the program.

**Chairman Porter** said in essence the buck tag will be thirty dollars, but if you get turned down for a buck tag, and you want to reapply for something else then you will get a check back for \$20.00.

**Representative DeKrey** said that was correct.

**Chairman Porter** said if you want to purchase a doe tag it is still \$20.00.

**Representative Meyer** asked if this could be done simultaneously or do they have to reissue it.

**Representative DeKrey** said that if they check on their application that a buck is the only license they will accept that is checked on their application, but if they fail to get a buck, they will automatically get a doe license if they check that.

**Representative Meyer** asked if they had to send any paperwork back.

**Representative DeKrey** said no.

**Representative DeKrey** made a motion to accept the proposed amendments.

**Representative Hanson** seconded the motion.

**Representative Charging** asked about the boxes on the application.

**Chairman Porter** said that if they put the two boxes on the application with a first choice and second choice and they put down for two bucks and they don't get drawn for either one of those bucks, they will get a check back for \$20.00. If they would have put a buck in choice one and a doe in choice two, they will get a \$30.00 doe tag basically.

**Representative Drovdal** said he understands that they are raising the buck tag to \$30.00 and there is a \$10.00 nonrefundable administrative fee.

**Chairman Porter** took a voice vote. The motion prevailed.

**Representative Hanson** moved for a **do pass as amended** on HB 1364.

**Representative DeKrey** seconded the motion.

**Chairman Porter** asked for discussion. Seeing none, he asked the clerk to call the roll on a do pass as amended on HB 1364. Let the record show 8 yes, 6 no, with no one absent. The bill will be carried to the floor by **Representative DeKrey**.

**FISCAL NOTE**  
**Requested by Legislative Council**  
02/07/2007

**REVISION**

Amendment to: HB 1364

**1A. State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				\$1,300,000		\$1,300,000
Expenditures				\$5,000		
Appropriations						

**1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

**2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

Currently both antlered and antlerless resident deer gun season licenses cost \$20 each. This bill adds a \$10 nonrefundable application fee for each application for an antlered deer hunting license.

**B. Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

In recent years about 65,000 hunters applied for antlered deer hunting licenses each year. The nonrefundable application fee will result in increase revenue for the game and fish fund of \$650,000 per year.

**3. State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

**A. Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

The net revenue increase from this bill is about \$650,000 per year or \$1,300,000 each biennium.

**B. Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

This change in fee structure will require one time software and application system changes. It is estimated that this will cost about \$5,000.

**C. Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

<b>Name:</b>	Paul T. Schadewald	<b>Agency:</b>	ND Game and Fish Department
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-6328	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	02/07/2007

**FISCAL NOTE**  
**Requested by Legislative Council**  
02/05/2007

Amendment to: HB 1364

**1A. State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				\$1,300,000		\$1,300,000
Expenditures				\$5,000		
Appropriations						

**1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

**2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

Currently both antlered and antlerless resident deer gun season licenses cost \$20 each. This bill adds a \$10 nonrefundable application fee for each application for an antlered deer hunting license.

**B. Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

In recent years about 65,000 hunters applied for antlered deer hunting licenses each year. The nonrefundable application fee will result in increase revenue for the game and fish fund of \$650,000 per year.

**3. State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

**A. Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

The net revenue decrease from this bill is about \$650,000 per year or \$1,300,000 each biennium.

**B. Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

This change in fee structure will require one time software and application system changes. It is estimated that this will cost about \$5,000.

**C. Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

<b>Name:</b>	Paul T. Schadewald	<b>Agency:</b>	ND Game and Fish Department
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-6328	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	02/05/2007

**FISCAL NOTE**  
**Requested by Legislative Council**  
01/15/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1364

**1A. State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				(\$400,000)		(\$400,000)
Expenditures				\$20,000		\$10,000
Appropriations						

**1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

**2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

Currently both antlered and antlerless resident deer gun season licenses cost \$20 each. This bill changes the resident fee to \$35 for antlered deer tags and \$10 for antlerless tags.

**B. Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

In recent years about 40,000 antlered tags and 80,000 antlerless tags have been sold for \$20 each year. This bill results in a \$600,000 revenue increase for antlered tags and a \$800,000 decrease in revenue for antlerless tags each year.

**3. State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

**A. Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

The net revenue decrease from this bill is about \$200,000 per year or \$400,000 each biennium.

**B. Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

This change in fee structure will require one time software and application system changes. It is estimated that this will cost about \$10,000. It is anticipated that because the antlered and antlerless tag fees are different, more refund checks will have to be issued and mailed. If a customer applies for a \$35 antlered tag but gets a 3rd choice doe tag, a \$25 refund would have to be made. There would be costs related to this.

**C. Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

Name:	Paul T. Schadewald	Agency:	ND Game and Fish Department
Phone Number:	328-6328	Date Prepared:	01/16/2007

**House Amendments to HB 1364 (70633.0101) - Natural Resources Committee  
02/02/2007**

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to amend and reenact section 20.1-03-12.2 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to antlered deer license application fees; and to declare an emergency.

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

**SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 20.1-03-12.2 of the North Dakota Century Code is amended and reenacted as follows:

**20.1-03-12.2. Hunting license and permit application fees.** Each resident applying for a license or permit to hunt elk, moose, or bighorn sheep under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of three dollars for each license or permit application in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of the license or permit under this chapter. Each resident applying for a license or permit to hunt antlered deer under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of ten dollars for each license or permit application in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of the license or permit under this chapter. Each nonresident applying for a license or permit to hunt bighorn sheep under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of one hundred dollars in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of a license or permit to hunt bighorn sheep under this chapter.

**SECTION 2. EMERGENCY.** This Act is declared to be an emergency measure."

Renumber accordingly



Date: 2-1-07  
Roll Call Vote #: \_\_\_\_\_

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1364

House **Natural Resources** \_\_\_\_\_ Committee☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken At least once

Motion Made By Deke Seconded By Larsen

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman – Rep. Porter			Rep. Hanson		
Vice-Chairman – Rep Damschen			Rep. Hunskor		
Rep. Charging			Rep. Kelsh		
Rep. Clark			Rep. Meyer		
Rep. DeKrey			Rep. Solberg		
Rep. Drovdal					
Rep. Hofstad					
Rep. Keiser					
Rep. Nottestad					

Total Yes 17 No 0

Absent

## Floor Assignment

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

Date: 2-1-07  
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1364

House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number To pass as amended

Action Taken \_\_\_\_\_

Motion Made By Hanson Seconded By DeKrey

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman – Rep. Porter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Rep. Hanson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Vice-Chairman – Rep Damschen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Rep. Hunskor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Charging		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rep. Kelsh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Rep. Clark	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Rep. Meyer		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rep. DeKrey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Rep. Solberg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Rep. Drovdal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Rep. Hofstad		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Rep. Keiser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Rep. Nottestad		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Total Yes 8 No 6

Absent DeKrey

Floor Assignment 0

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

To pass as amended  
prevails

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1364: Natural Resources Committee (Rep. Porter, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS and when so amended, recommends DO PASS (8 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1364 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.**

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to amend and reenact section 20.1-03-12.2 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to antlered deer license application fees; and to declare an emergency.

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

**SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 20.1-03-12.2 of the North Dakota Century Code is amended and reenacted as follows:

**20.1-03-12.2. Hunting license and permit application fees.** Each resident applying for a license or permit to hunt elk, moose, or bighorn sheep under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of three dollars for each license or permit application in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of the license or permit under this chapter. Each resident applying for a license or permit to hunt antlered deer under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of ten dollars for each license or permit application in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of the license or permit under this chapter. Each nonresident applying for a license or permit to hunt bighorn sheep under this chapter must be assessed a nonrefundable application fee of one hundred dollars in addition to the fee charged for the issuance of a license or permit to hunt bighorn sheep under this chapter.

**SECTION 2. EMERGENCY.** This Act is declared to be an emergency measure."

Renumber accordingly

2007 TESTIMONY

HB 1364

Item #1

## 2006 LICENSE FEES

	Deer		Antelope		Moose		Sheep		Elk	
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident
Arizona	\$24.50	\$130.50	\$70.00	\$330.00			\$200.00	\$1,005.00	\$83.00	\$405.00
Colorado	\$34.00	\$299.00	\$34.00	\$299.00	\$254.00	\$1,059.00	\$254.00	\$1,059.00	\$49.00	\$499.00
Idaho	\$12.75	\$141.50	\$30.75	\$258.50	\$174.50	\$1,759.50	\$174.50	\$1,759.50	\$30.75	\$372.50
Montana	\$16.00	\$80.00	\$19.00	\$205.00	\$80.00	\$755.00	\$80.00	\$755.00	\$20.00	\$593.00
Nevada	\$43.00	\$253.00	\$73.00	\$313.00			\$133.00	\$1,213.00	\$138.00	\$1,218.00
New Mexico	\$39.00	\$270.00	\$59.00	\$276.00			\$159.00	\$3,166.00	\$59.00 to \$89.00	\$331.00 to \$766.00
Oregon	\$19.50	\$264.50	\$36.50	\$277.50			\$101.50	\$1,083.00	\$34.50	\$361.50
South Dakota	\$35.00	\$195.00	\$35.00	\$195.00			\$255.00 (Black Hills)		\$155.00 (Black Hills)	
									\$305.00 (Custer State Park)	
Utah	\$40.00	\$263.00	\$50.00	\$288.00	\$308.00	\$1,513.00	\$508.00	\$1,513.00	\$65.00	\$388.00
Washington	\$39.42	\$394.20			\$114.98	\$1,150.28	\$114.98	\$1,150.28	\$34.92	\$394.20
Wyoming	\$35.00	\$273.00	\$31.00	\$238.00	\$95.00	\$1,213.00	\$100.00	\$1,913.00	\$47.00	\$483.00

NEW FOR 2007

42.25 232.75 85.00 485.00

212.50 1,407.50 121.50 595.00

*Item #2*

Testimony- HB 1364  
Rep. Jon Nelson District 7

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the House Natural Resource Committee, I am pleased to appear before you today to introduce HB 1364.

The text of HB 1364 is very similar to a bill this committee heard last session. It simply increases the cost of a antlered deer license to \$35 and lowers the cost of a antlerless license to \$10. It also allows the Game and Fish Department to reduce the cost of a antlerless license after September 1 in areas that have an abundance in the deer population.

The primary reason I am introducing this bill is to begin to control the population of deer in areas of the state that have been experiencing high numbers. Another component though would spread the antlered hunter licenses more evenly across the state as there would be more incentive for applicants to apply for antlerless licenses.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today and I ask you for a Do-Pass recommendation on HB 1364.



Cass County  
**WILDLIFE CLUB**

Box 336  
Casselton, ND 58012




**TESTIMONY OF FOSTER HAGER**  
**CASS COUNTY WILDLIFE CLUB**  
PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE  
ON


**HB 1364**  
January 26, 2007

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The CCWC opposes HB 1364 because it makes the antlered deer license a rich man's sport.

The law we now have seems to be working. If it ain't broke - don't fix it.





"VARIETY IN HUNTING AND FISHING"

## NORTH DAKOTA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

100 NORTH BISMARCK EXPRESSWAY BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58501-5095 PHONE 701-328-6300 FAX 701-328-6352

*Item # 4*

### Testimony on House Bill 1364 Dealing with Fees for Deer Hunting Licenses

The North Dakota Game and Fish Department opposes HB 1364 because of fiscal impact, feedback from customers, and its failure to accomplish anything positive for the deer license lottery system.

1. The Department is getting a steady flow of complaints about this bill. The main complaint is that it accomplishes nothing other than take \$15 more from buck hunters and \$10 less from doe hunters. It will not reduce the number of applicants for antlered tags nor change the odds of getting an antlered tag significantly. Since virtually all the antlerless deer tags are sold at the current \$20 level, this bill will not help to sell antlerless tags. The few areas that have leftover tags have significant access and population challenges and a reduction in the license fee will not have a major impact on license sales. If the customer does make a financial choice, they are most likely forgo purchasing an extra doe tag and only apply for the antlered tag.
2. The bill unnecessarily complicates the deer license lottery system. Currently all resident deer licenses except youth tags are sold for \$20. Applicants may have a buck tag as their first choice and a doe tag as second choice. If the buck tag is not available, they may draw an antlerless tag. The prices of these tags are the same, so no refund is needed. Under this bill a person applying for a buck tag would send in a \$35 check. If they are drawn and given a second choice antlerless tag, the Department must send them both a license and a refund check. This is a significant added work load that is unnecessarily added.
3. Based on 2006 sales the bill has a significant negative fiscal impact for the Game and Fish Fund as explained on the fiscal note.
4. The bill sets fees for antlered and antlerless tags, but does not address what the fee should be for a resident archery deer license that is an "any deer" tag. Some clarification on this would be helpful.






North Dakota Chapter

## THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY

P.O. BOX 1442 • BISMARCK, ND 58502

*Item #5*



**TESTIMONY OF MIKE McENROE  
NORTH DAKOTA CHAPTER OF THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY  
PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE  
ON HB 1364, JANUARY 26, 2007**

CHAIRMAN PORTER AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

I am Mike McEnroe speaking on behalf of the North Dakota Chapter of The Wildlife Society. The Chapter opposes HB 1364 creating a \$35 antlered deer license and a \$10 antlerless deer license. The bill is intended to make it "easier" to get a buck license by reducing the number of applicants and to help sell the remaining "doe" licenses. Neither of these will happen. Buck licenses will not be much easier to draw, and NDGFD sells virtually all of the doe licenses now.

What the bill does is to take the first step down the slippery slope of distributing hunting licenses to those who are willing or able to pay more. While some might argue that the increase from \$20 to \$35 is a small step, it is the first step. Next session, if some one is still unhappy about not drawing a buck license, do we then consider increasing the price to \$50 or \$75?

HB 1364 violates the principles of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation – that allocation of fishing and hunting opportunities be by due process of law and equal chance, not by wealth or the ability to pay.

The NDCTWS asks that you give HB 1364 a "Do Not Pass" recommendation.

## **2006 Deer License Statistics\***

**Deer Gun License Numbers: approximately 143,000**

	<b>Antlered Deer (Bucks)</b>	<b>Antlerless Deer (Does)</b>
<b># of Licenses</b>	<b>40,400</b>	<b>102,600</b>
<b># of applicants</b>	<b>67,440</b>	<b>20,385</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>27,040</b>	

**NEED to reduce Buck applicants by 27,040 to eliminate "unhappy" applicants**

**40,400 Buck licenses at \$ 35.00 provides a gain of \$ 606,000**

**100,000 Doe licenses at \$ 10.00 provides a loss of \$ 1,000,000**

**NET LOSS of \$ 394,000/year**

### **MUZZLELOADER SEASON:**

**approximately 9,000 applicants for 1,345 Antlered white-tailed licenses**

**approximately 725 applicants for 1,345 antlerless white-tailed licenses**

**\* data from NDGFD, 1-24-07. Figures rounded off by Mike McEnroe**